# AN INVESTIGATION OF THE NEED FOR FORMALIZED TRAINING OF FACILITY MAINTENANCE PERSONNEL

JAMES C. DAY, JR.
THOMAS L. LONEGAN

64

# AN INVESTIGATION OF THE NEED FOR FORMALIZED TRAINING OF FACILITY MAINTENANCE PERSONNEL

by

James C. Day, Jr.

Commander, Civil Engineer Corps, U. S. N.

and

Thomas L. Lonegan

Lieutenant, Civil Engineer Corps, U. S. N.

Submitted in fulfillment of the
requirements for the course

INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH
MN - 400

United States Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California

1964

Thesis

# AN INVESTIGATION OF THE NEED FOR FORMALIZED TRAINING OF FACILITY MAINTENANCE PERSONNEL

by

James C. Day, Jr.

and

Thomas L. Lonegan

This work is accepted as fulfilling
the requirements for the course

INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH
MN - 400

United States Naval Postgraduate School

ABSTRACT

This research paper is the result of an investigation of the need for formalized training of facility maintenance personnel in the Naval Shore Establishment. The need for increased craftsmen productivity is developed from an analysis of the physical composition of facilities, backlog of essential maintenance and funding. Past and present organizational and management methods to increase productivity are explained. A historical analysis of apprenticeship is developed to show that the present national shortage of craftsmen is but the latest of a periodic reoccurring shortage. A description of present required craftsmanship training procedures in the Navy is also provided.

The above factors, that affect in various ways the quality and quantity of craftsmen required, act as a framework from which to view the major undertaking of this investigation. This was a nationwide survey of the status of facilities maintenance craftsmenship at Naval activities. Data was accumulated with respect to age distributions, attrition rates, methods of recruitment, classifications, and the types of training available. Subjective comments concerning the above were also collected. A comparative analysis of this information was conducted with equivalent data. Developed on the same categories of craftsmen used by private and construction industries. Information was collected by review of the literature, questionnaires, correspondence and personal interviews.

The findings of the investigation indicated a serious problem in both the immediate future and over the long run unless corrective measures are taken. The direction of these measures are presented as recommendations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

# SECTION I

## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

### I. BACKGROUND

The physical facilities of the Naval Shore Establishment would currently cost over twenty billion dollars to replace.[1] Eighty five percent of these were built during or before the Korean War and more than half of the Navy's buildings are overage or obsolescent.[2] Age, however, is not the only concern. Tremendous technological changes have occured since 1950 which have demanded new services from the existing facilities. Built for other purposes, the facilities are often hard pressed to provide these services.

Current funding is not sufficient to support an adequate level of maintenance or halt the growth of the maintenance backlog. Thus age and inadequate maintenace are producing an unsatisfactory state of readiness of naval facilities.

The performance of this maintenance, for the most part, is accomplished by craftsmen of the building and construction trades employed in Public Works Activities of the Navy throughout the world.

[1] Projected from 1961 data from the Department of the Navy, Facilities, Management Study, Vol. II, 26 October, 1962. p. 97.

[2] Stated by a Bureau of Yards and Docks representative during a management seminar address at the District Public Works Office, San Bruno, California, January, 1964.

Much progress has been and is being made in increasing the effectiveness of their efforts organizationally and procedurally.[3] What is being done to increase their productivity as individuals? It is generally recognized that productivity is correlated with the degree and type of training received. This applies to both initial training of a skill and the periodic updating of that skill--especially in this age of technological evolution.

The Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, who is responsible for the maintenance of the Naval Shore Establishments, stated on 14 February, 1964:

> "In the past we have had a tendency to train people on a catch as catch can basis. If somebody is available we send them off to a course or give them some special training."

Initial training, of course, is not a problem if it is possible to directly hire craftsmen already trained--when, where and in the numbers required. There is no such easy solution to updating skills.

## II. THE PROBLEM

The problem with which this investigation is principally concerned is solved in the development of answers to the following four questions:

1. To what extent are Public Works Activities able to hire facility maintenance craftsmen, already trained-when, where and in the numbers required at the present?

2. What will the Navy's need for such craftsmen be in

[3] See Section III, p 13.

the immediate future (the next five years) and in the long run (the next forty-five years)?

3. What problems can be expected in procuring such craftsmen from labor markets in the immediate future and the long run?

4. To what extent does the Navy presently provide formalized training, both initially through apprenticeship programs and periodically through skill updating programs, for facility maintenance personnel in Public Works Activities?

## III. DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

The very nature of this investigation requires terms which may be peculiar to the Naval Shore Establishment, to the construction industry, to education, and to personnel management specialists. In order, however, to make this investigation as meaningful as possible to those unfamiliar with these several fields, special terms and phraseology are avoided where possible. Where unavoidably used they are explained in their context or by appropriate footnotes, thus eliminating a formal explanation of terms at this point.

Throughout the paper there is a degree of repetitive mention of various naval directives, offices or agencies. Such names will be spelled out in full when first introduced and immediately followed by the letter abbreviation. Thereafter the abbreviation will be used in the interest of brevity.

## IV. LIMITATIONS

This study is not intended to produce a handbook of quick, effortless and inexpensive techniques of how to formally train competent facility maintenance craftsmen. Rather, it will attempt to establish if a real need for formalized training exists now or can be expected to exist in the future.

This study is limited to facility maintenance personnel due to the evolution of an excellent facilities maintenance management program; the consolidation of Public Works Activities; and, most recently, the assignment of facility maintenance funds--Navy wide-- to the Bureau of Yards and Docks (BUDOCKS). All of these organizational, fiscal and management changes assigns, for the first time, to one Bureau both the responsibility and authority to provide the proper training to those personnel who carry out the Bureau's mission with respect to maintenance of the Shore Establishment's physical facilities.

It is the belief of the writers that development of formalized training programs can not and should not be attempted until the existance and magnitude of the need are known. The purpose of this study is to provide such information.

## SECTION II

## METHODS, MATERIALS, TECHNIQUES AND PROCEDURES

### I. INITIAL INVESTIGATION

Initial study in connection with this paper was directed at determining what efforts were being made at present by the Navy to increase the productivity of facility maintenance personnel. This was accomplished through a review of current Navy facilities management studies, standard maintenance management manuals of BUDOCKS, and finally, through officially promulgated policy statements in this field of study. Although much progress was evident on current methods to improve productivity, (See Section III, Page 14), no information was available on current attempts to procure formally trained personnel or update their skills once hired.

### II. QUESTIONNAIRE

A questionnaire, (See Figures 1 and 2, Pages 6 and 7), was prepared and with a letter of transmittal was forwarded to one hundred and sixty two activities. Navy and Marine Corps activities, located within the continental United States and Hawaii, with a Public Works Officer assigned, were selected.[4] The information requested and the purpose was as follows:

1. The total number of journeymen[5] employed. This

[4] Activities solicted were selected through the use of the Bureau of Yard and Docks, Civil Engineer Corps Directory, NAVDOCKS P-1, May 1963.

[5] The term "journeymen" is used interchangeably in the trades with "skilled craftsmen." Within the Navy, the term journeymen is used almost exclusively. By definition, either means, "One who has served an apprenticeship."

Activity_____

Location_____

NUMBER

1. Total Journeymen Employed: _____

2. Grouped By Age:

| | |
|---|---|
| 20 to 24 years | _____ |
| 25 to 29 years | _____ |
| 30 to 34 years | _____ |
| 35 to 39 years | _____ |
| 40 to 44 years | _____ |
| 45 to 49 years | _____ |
| 50 to 54 years | _____ |
| 55 to 59 years | _____ |
| 60 years and over | _____ |

3. Anticipated Journeymen Losses Due to All Causes
(Based on past attrition and future projections)

| | |
|---|---|
| Fiscal Year 1965 | _____ |
| Fiscal Year 1966 | _____ |
| Fiscal Year 1967 | _____ |
| Fiscal Year 1968 | _____ |
| Fiscal Year 1969 | _____ |

4. Total Journeymen By Specific Trade:

| | |
|---|---|
| Electrician | _____ |
| Carpenter | _____ |
| Painter | _____ |
| Plumber | _____ |
| Other (list on back side) | _____ |

Fig. 1 - Apprenticeship and Skill Updating Questionnaire

5. Do you have a certified apprentice program? _____

If so, in which trades and for what duration

Trade_____ Duration_____years

Trade_____ Duration_____years

Trade_____ Duration_____years

6. Do you have a skill updating program? _____

If so, in which trades and for what duration

Trade_____Duration_____months

Trade_____Duration_____months

Trade_____Duration_____months

Is skill updating available through a:

Local School (trade, high, or college) _____

Local manufacturer of industry _____

Local activity _____

Other _____

7. Present method of recruiting journeymen

(Rate 1, 2, 3, or 4)

Activity Apprenticeship Program _____

Outside hire of certified journeymen _____

Activity promotion of helper classification _____

Outside hire of those with experience but no formal training _____

Fig. 2 - Apprenticeship and Skill Updating Questionnaire (cont'd)

information was necessary to determine the total number of personnel included in the replies; to verify sub-totals of other information; and to determine the correlation between the size of activity and number of journeymen employed.

2. The number of journeymen by age groups in five year increments--starting at age twenty[6] and ending at sixty years and older--a total of nine age groups. The purpose of this information was to determine the long run replacement needs of the Navy; to determine if the population was evenly distributed by age group and if not, approximately when a serious problem could be expected.

3. The anticipated number of journeymen losses due to retirement, disability, resignations, disciplinary action, deaths, and other causes. To prevent guessing, it was requested that the data be based on previous years statistics. The data was requested by fiscal year--from 1965 through 1969. The function of this question was to determine the anticipated losses in the immediate future from all causes.

4. The number of journeymen by trade. Five of the assumed most populated trades were listed with space for additional write-ins. The purpose of this question was to determine those particular trades that, due to the number of journeymen involved, should receive primary attention in the development of formal training programs.

5. Each activity was asked if it had a certified apprentice program and if so, in what crafts and for what number of years. The purpose of this question was to determine

[6]Assumed to be the youngest age at which a man could qualify as a journeyman, considering most apprenticeship programs are of four years duration.

the correlation between active apprenticeship programs and size of acitivity; what correlation existed with questions 3 and 4 above; what correlation existed between activities with respect to the types of trades apprenticed and their duration.

6. Each activity was asked the same questions, for the same reasons as question 5 above with respect to having a skill updating program. In addition, each activity was asked if skill updating programs existed in their area; if so, the subject or skill and the duration of the course and by whom the course was operated. An additional purpose of this question was to determine if all activities in the same locality were equally aware of local existing training programs.

7. Each activity was requested to indicate its present method of recruiting journeymen, by rating the four methods known to the writers: (1) by graduation through an activity apprenticeship program; (2) by promotion of journeymen helpers; (3) by hiring certified journeymen from the labor market, and (4) by hiring men from the labor market with general experience but no formal training. The purpose of this question was to determine the availability of skilled craftsmen in the labor market[7] and secondly to determine the preference between promotion of helpers and hiring persons with general experience.

8. Each activity was requested to indicate what type of activity it was, i.e. shipyard, air station, etc. The

[7]It is assumed that a certified journeyman would always be hired before promoting helpers or hiring persons with only general experience.

purpose of this question was to determine if any correlation existed between the type of activity and the information provided through the above questions.

The letter of transmittal, (See Fig. 3, page11 ), explained the purpose of the study and requested the questionnaire be returned by 15 March, 1964.

It was decided not to request comments on the premise that those who were interested and had constructive information to offer would do so. They did.

## III. INTERVIEWS

Arrangements were made to conduct interviews with several professionally "expert" persons involved in various aspects of the need for, testing, selection, initial training, and skill updating of skilled craftsmen--both in the Navy and private industry. Considerable information used in the development of this paper came from these individuals, either through oral interviews or literature they provided. Of particular value were interviews held with:

1. Mr. Gilbert O. Davidson, Apprenticeship Consultant, Department of Industrial Relations, State of California. Mr. Davidson, both during the interview and later by correspondence, was of enormous assistance in providing a variety of data with respect to the status of apprenticeship programs on the national and State of California levels in the construction and manufacturing industries.

2. Doctor Roy H. Hutchison, Director of Training, U. S. Naval Air Station, Alameda, California. Dr. Hutchison, in addition to providing much information on apprenticeship

U. S. NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

SMC #2710

Monterey, California 93940

14 February 1964

Dear Sir:

CDR. J. C. Day, Jr., CEC USN and Lt. T. L. Lonegan, CEC USN are presently conducting a research study in connection with the Management Department of the U. S. Naval Postgraduate School, and request your assistance. An attempt is being made to determine the need for developing apprenticeship programs that will train and educate Public Works journeymen to the levels that will be required in the coming years.

Your assistance in completing the enclosed questionnaire will be appreciated. Because of the restricted time schedule for evaluating this information it is requested that the questionnaire be returned by March 15.

Very respectfully,

J. C. DAY, JR.
Commander, U. S. Navy

Fig. 3 - Questionnaire Letter of Transmittal

training in the Navy, allowed the writers to use his personal library on the historical and economic aspects of apprenticeship training.

## IV. REVIEW OF PERIODICALS

An exhaustive review was made in the U. S. Naval Postgraduate School Library, primarily in the field of current periodicals. The emphasis was on international, national and specific industrial trends in formal training. Also surveyed were testing procedures, interviewing, program formulation, and a number of special studies on new techniques currently being tested. A considerable number of pertinent articles and papers were ordered from the Bureau of Apprenticeship of the Department of Labor but, unfortunately, were not received prior to the sumbission of this paper.

## V. CORRESPONDENCE

Based on data received and information learned from the initial investigation, returned questionnaires, interviews and the review of current periodicals, correspondence was conducted with a number of Naval activities which have active apprenticeship programs. Of particular value was information received from:

1. U. S. Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland
2. U. S. Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California
3. Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California

## SECTION III

## THE NEED FOR PRODUCTIVITY

### I. INSUFFICIENT MAINTENANCE FUNDS

Funds made available and used for facilities maintenance are not sufficient to support the level of maintenance necessary from the standpoint of sound engineering and business standards. For the past eight years the backlog of essential maintenance, (BEM), of U. S. Navy owned facilities, (Class 1 and Class II property),[8] has approximated one percent of the replacement value of such facilities. This is illustrated by Figures 4 and 5, (pp 14 and 15), which show that at the end of Fiscal Year, (FY), 1955 the Navy facilities had a replacement value of $13.13 billion and a BEM of $152.2 million. This had grown to $18.57 billion plant value and $180.4 million BEM by the end of FY 1961.

Looking into the immediate future, it is apparent that, unless some positive action not now programmed is taken, the backlog of essential maintenance will not be reduced, but may even increase above one percent.[9] These assumptions are borne out by Table I, (p. 16), which shows that the level of budget obligations and expenditures for the maintenance of the Navy facilities has remained relatively static in the range of $205/$212 million annually.

[8]Class I property is land and Class II consists of buildings and structures.

[9]Department of the Navy, "Facilities Management Study," Review of Management of the Department of the Navy, Vol II, Study 6, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962), p. 38.




Fig 4. - Plant Replacement Cost In Billions of Dollars (Department of the Navy, Facilities Management Study, Vol. II, 26 October 1962, p. 97.)




Fig. 5 - Backlog of Essential Maintenance

(Department of the Navy, Facilities Management Study, Vol. II 26 October 1962, p. 98.)

Table I - Comparison of Budget Obligation and Actual

Expenditures For Maintenance of Real Property

| FISCAL YEAR | BUDGET SOURCE: NCB 153 Summary | EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS SOURCE: BuDocks BEAM Rpt. |
|---|---|---|
| 1961 | $208,022,000 | $235,886,175 |
| 1962 | Full Year 205,501,000 | Projected 220,000,000<br>(6 months)109,885,084 |
| 1963 | 212,395,000 | |

All figures include O & M Navy

O & M Marine Corps

RDT&E

NIF

Maintenance, Real Property

Compiled by Bureau of Yards and Docks 5/16/62

Note: Expenditures are those incurred and entered during the fiscal year.

(Department of the Navy, Facilities Management Study, Vol. II, 26 October, 1962, p. 99.)

A portion of the increases in both the backlog of essential maintenance and in the replacement value of the facilities between 1955 and 1961 results from cost increases during this period. However, by adjusting the 1961 figure to 1955 dollars, a net increase of $2.14 billion in 1955 has occurred. (This included taking the plant acquisitions and disposals occuring during the period into consideration.) Thus, this $2.14 billion increase represents the physical expansion of the Navy's facilities and as such it has been a direct influence upon the over-all maintenance workload.

## II. SIZE, AGE, AND COMPOSITION OF FACILITIES

The exact extent to which past deferrals of essential facility maintenance have had a deleterious effect upon the support of the Operating Forces or have resulted in abnormal future costs is impossible to determine because the Navy's system of records and reports does not lend itself to a definite appraisal of this area. Nevertheless, sufficient documentation exists in the form of Navy Inspector General, (NIG), reports to show that it has, in numerous instances, been a significant factor in morale, in limiting operational flexibility, and in generating abnormal future maintenance costs. These reports have included examples of barracks, BOQs, hospitals, runways, and aprons that have deteriorated beyond the point of economic repair. Additionally, the Navy's high BEM has been a concern to the Congress, as evidenced by the House of Representatives Report on the FY 1963 DOD Appropriation Bill.

The facilities of the Navy are undergoing constant evaluation that is tending to increase both the magnitude and the relative urgency of the maintenance function. As the existing plant increases in age, additional maintenance workload can be expected. With respect to the new facilities entering the plant account through the Military Construction Program-Navy, (MCON), the complexity of the plant is increasing due to changes in naval weapons systems which have increased the requirement for environmental controls such as heating, cooling, and ventilating. The increase in this type of control, with its inherent complexity and more narrow limits within which these sophisticated equipments must be operated, further increases the maintenance workload as well as limiting the ability to defer essential maintenance without incurring immediate drastic results.[10]

## III. BACKLOG OF ESSENTIAL MAINTENANCE

The term "backlog of essential maintenance" is defined in NAVDOCKS P-322, Vol. 1 as follows: "The backlog of Essential Maintenance and Repair of Public Works and Public Utilities such as buildings, structures, pavements, utility systems, grounds, etc., which should be corrected to conform to maintenance standard as contained in NAVDOCKS P-322. The deficiencies should be of such urgency that they should be funded approximately 12 months following the reporting date."

The BEM is made up of several thousand individual

[10]Department of the Navy, Op. cit., pp. 39-40.

projects, each of which has been developed on a sound engineering basis under the supervision of a qualified Public Works Officer, usually a Navy Civil Engineer Corps Officer. At any one time, this backlog to some extent represents projects which are in the process of being funded and scheduled for accomplishment. However, the great bulk of the backlog is maintenance work that, although meeting the criteria of the above definition, has had to be deferred because of an over-all insufficiency of funds alloted for real property maintenance. It is the magnitude and the continuing nature of this latter portion of the backlog that presents a serious problem in maintaining the Navy's facilities at the level which, from the standpoint of sound engineering and business standards (developed and generally accepted by industry), is considered most economical. BUDOCKS has sponsored maintenance management workshops and has had direct contact with major industrial corporations owning facilities comparable to the various types of Navy facilities. Contacts with major industrial corporations have been accomplished through participation in maintenance management courses given by the American Management Association. As a result of these proceedings, BUDOCKS has arrived at the professional opinion that, in order to overcome accelerated deterioration induced by the non-performance or overlong deferral of essential maintenance work, it would be in the best overall economic interest of the Department of the Navy to reduce the present BEM to a level of 0.25% of the replacement

value of the Navy-owned facilities as illustrated by Figure 6, (p. 21), and to endeavor to hold the BEM within this limit.[11]

## IV. FACILITIES MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT

During the past ten years, the Navy has developed a facilities maintenance management program that has proven itself to be highly effective in many respects in partially solving the afore mentioned problems.

In October 1954, the Secretary of Defense, (SECDEF) issued policies and objectives governing maintenance of real property and operations of utilities, which were immediately implemented by the Secretary of the Navy, (SEC NAV), with SEC NAV Instruction 11011.5 of 21 October, 1954, Subj: Objectives and Policies Relating to the Real Property Maintenance and Utilities Operation Program. This instruction required that supervisory improvement programs aimed at improved management and supervision of maintenance and utilities operations would be initiated and/or continued. This instruction provides the character for establishment of the controlled maintenance program in the Department of the Navy.

In order to amplify the policies and objectives set forth in his October 1954 directive, SEC DEF issued DOD Directive 4165.9 of 23 June 1955, which was promulgated by SEC NAV Instruction 11014.3 of 29 June 1955, Subj: Programs for Management of Real Property Maintenance Activities. This program contained provisions for operational guides and for

[11]Department of the Navy, Op. cit., p. 40.

Fig. 6 - Backlog of Essential Maintenance As A Percent of Replacement Costs

cost classifications, property records, performance and maintenance standards, maintenance force size, planning and estimating, inspection, job order system, scheduling backlog of work and evaluation and reporting, which would form the basis for a controlled maintenance program.

BUDOCKS prepared, and in November 1956 issued, TP-PW-33 now redesignated P-321--Maintenance Management of Public Works and Public Utilities. This document contained a controlled maintenance program for implementation by field activities which was responsible to SEC NAV direction. This action was taken by BUDOCKS in accordance with responsibility assigned by Navy Regulations, to provide technical direction for the Navy in matters relating to maintenance of real property.

In SEC NAV Instruction 11014.7 of 21 February 1958, Subj: Maintenance Management of Public Works and Public Utilities, SEC NAV expressed his concern over ever-increasing cost of the maintenance of the Navy's shore facilities and the non-availability of required funds. He stressed the fact that the only means available at that time to close the gap between fund requirement and fund availability was through improved maintenance management. SEC NAV advised bureaus and offices to accelerate adoption of procedures for the controlled maintenance programs set forth in TP-PW-33.

BUDOCKS reissued TP-PW-33 as NAVDOCKS P-321 in 1959. This reissue incorporated revisions and contained changes which were evolutionary. Since inception, the controlled maintenance program had been studied and evaluated, including civilian consultant evaluation, in an attempt to

continually improve the responsiveness of the program. This is a continuing process.[12]

On 24 October 1963, BUDOCKS Notice 11014, Subj: Advanced information on revisions to publications on Maintenance Management of Public Works, Public Utilities, and Transportation equipment was issued. Its purpose was to inform addressees of changes now in process for the subject publications and to establish 1 January 1964 as the effective date for Navy-wide installation on revised procedures. These procedures are the result of a comprehensive review of the various management programs developed by BUDOCKS, and as a result of pilot tests of revised procedures at several activities. Most of the latter revisions are in the area of simplification, correlation and reduction of the number of reports required by the program.

The establishment of the Controlled Maintenance Programs in the Navy and Marine Corps has become fact and multi-million dollars savings have resulted, but optimum management and program effectiveness are far from being accomplished. One particular trend that has been and continues to be evident in the attempt to maximize the effectiveness of the Controlled Maintenance is the consolidation of public works organizations into larger activities.

## V. PUBLIC WORKS ACTIVITIES

At the local activity level there are three principal

[12]Department Of the Navy, Op. cit., pp. 32-33.

procedures and corresponding sizes of public works organizations through which facilities maintenance is performed:

1. An activity may have its own public works department, directed by a Civil Engineer Corps officer, with sufficient personnel to physically accomplish all routine maintenance and minor repair. (In the case of Marine Corps activities, it is a maintenance department headed by a Marine Corps officer having an engineering background). Projects beyond the capability of the public works department are accomplished by contract. Public Works officers may have additional duties as officers-in-charge of construction, (OICC), on small contracts and as resident officers-in-charge of construction, (ROICC), on large contracts. District or area public works officers are OICC for the larger contracts and, as such, advertise, open bid, and make contract awards.

2. The public works department of a major activity adjacent to a number of smaller activities may be designated as the lead shop to perform most or all of the maintenance work for the small activities. Responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the facilities remains with the commanding officer of the smaller activities. They place work requests with the lead shops, citing funds for the work requested.

3. A public works center (PWC) may be established as a separate activity under management control of BUDOCKS, usually to function under the Navy Industrial Fund concept, with the assigned mission of public works support to a group

of activities comprising a Naval base or similar complex. As in the case of the lead shop concept, all work performed by the PWC for its customer activities is done on a reimbursable basis under work requests received from the individual activities. The responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the facilities remain with the commanding officer to whose activity they are assigned, as does the authority to control expenditures for maintanance or repairs.[13]

The principle of promoting economy by consolidating common support function for two or more adjacent shore activities has long been accepted in managing the Naval Shore Establishment. During and since World War II, most Naval shore activities in close proximity to each other have received or extended such support. This principle is supported in General Order No. 19, and SEC NAV has given it added definition and emphasis by specific instructions calling for the consolidation of public works services wherever two or more shore activities are in close proximity. In past years numerous public works consolidations have been effected by having the public works department of one activity perform all or a portion of the public works functions for adjacent and usually smaller activities. In practically all cases the work was performed on a reimbursable basis. In addition, seven Public Works Centers have been established as separate activities under the management control of

13 Department of the Navy, Op. cit., pp. 12-13.

BUDOCKS.

Though initially somewhat restricted, under the added stimulus of SEC NAV, the scope of the seven Public Works Centers has been increased by directing that activities within given areas would obtain all of their public works support from the Public Works Centers.

At the present, there are twenty seven (27) recognized Navy complexes of geographically clustered activities throughout the world.[14] For example, there are now 72 separate activities in the Norfolk complex alone.[15] The quantity of facilities and maintenance personnel necessary to maintain them is numerous-approximately 40,000 public works personnel. Public Works Centers at Seven of these complexes employ approximately 16,500 personnel. It is expected that Public Works Centers will be established at, at least, three other complexes in the future, employing an additional 4000 public works employees.[16] This will result in at least ten major public works activities with an average personnel allowance of over 2000. The vast majority of these personnel are or should be, skilled craftsmen.

## VI. CURRENT LEVEL OF PRODUCTIVITY

During the period 1955 to 1961, the Navy has through

[14] See Table II, p. 27.

[15] Department of the Navy, Op. cit., p. 6

[16] Bureau of Yards and Docks Representative, loc. cit.

1. Boston, Massachusetts
2. Newport, Rhode Island * 1958
3. Portsmouth, New Hampshire
4. New London, Connecticut
5. New York, New York
6. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
7. Norfolk, Virginia * 1948
8. Charleston, South Carolina
9. Key West, Florida
10. Jacksonville, Florida
11. New Orleans, Louisiana
12. Great Lakes, Illinois
13. Guantanamo Bay, Cuba * 1956
14. San Diego, California * 1963
15. San Francisco, California
16. Los Angeles, California
17. Seattle, Washington
18. Bremerton, Washington
19. Pearl Harbor, Hawaii * 1954
20. Washington, D.C. (exclusive of the Navy Department)
21. Annapolis, Maryland
22. Rota, Spain
23. Naples, Italy
24. Yokosuka, Japan * 1963
25. Okinawa
26. Guam, M.I. * 1949
27. Subic Bay, Philippines * 1955

* Year a Public Works Center was established

**Table II - List of Naval Complexes - World Wide**

improved public works management and advancements in technology, steadily increased the productivity per man-hour of the labor force employed in public works functions.

During 1955, the last year before beginning the controlled maintenance program, the Navy was able to maintain $46.90 of plant account (replacement cost) for each maintenance dollar expended. Reports for 1961 indicate that $60.36 of plant account was maintained for each maintenance dollar spent.[17] During this time, BEM has been relatively static at one percent of plant replacement value expressed either as current dollars or in terms of 1955 dollars. This improvement in effectiveness has been achieved (1) by improving maintenance standards which establish a level of required maintenance consistant with the relation of particular facilities to the military mission of the activity and the Navy, and (2) by increasing productive effort. As shown on Figure 8, (page 30), from 1955 through 1961 the control of productive man-hours has been increased from forty seven to seventy seven percent.

In the same period, the amount of manpower devoted to alterations and improvement type work has decreased from nine to six percent, and the amount of effort on emergency type work has remained relatively constant at about two percent. There are practical limitations on how far these controls can increase or decrease the effort, since some alterations and improvement is necessary to meet changing conditions,

[17] See Fig. 7, p. 29.




Fig. 7

(Department of the Navy, Facilities Management Study, Vol. II, 26 October 1962, p. 100.)




Fig. 8 - Increase in Productivity 1959 - 1961

( Department of the Navy, Facilities Management Study, Vol II, 26 October, 1962, p. 101.)

and since some emergency work is desirable to avoid over-maintenance. Thus, while it is anticipated that the upward trend in public works effectiveness will be maintained, it is probable that, as over the past years, it will not be sufficient to do much more than offset the rising cost of the labor and materials employed in the maintenance effort. Accordingly, although every effort should be continued to exploit to the fullest improvements in management and in technology, such improvements cannot by themselves be relied upon to solve the problem of reducing the backlog of essential maintenance to the desired level.

The area that has in the past and continues in the present to hold the greatest promise is that of increasing the relative effectiveness in terms of productivity. As has been shown, a substantial increase in productivity has been possible through (1) the evolution of a facilities management program and (2) consolidation of public works activities. It has also been stated that these programs have practical limitations with respect to any future substantial increases in productivity. It is the contention of the writers of this paper that the relative effectiveness in terms of productivity of the labor and materials utilized in facility maintenance is also directly related to the degree and quality of the training given personnel. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to survey the present status and analyze the future need for formalized training of facility maintenance personnel in public works activities.

## SECTION IV

## HISTORY OF APPRENTICESHIP

Apprenticeship has been traced from ancient times through the present day. Summaries of apprenticeship programs from antiquity through the Medieval, the Elizabethan, and Early English Periods; the Colonial American Period; the Industrial Revolution and the period up to the passage of the National Apprenticeship Act in 1937 are a few of the historical highlights to be discussed in this section.

Since this study pertains to the need for training and increased productivity today, particular attention has been given to the general conditions in the past under which periodic need for better training has revealed itself.

This section was written in an attempt to include information that would present an integrated and total picture of apprenticeship.

### I. ANTIQUITY

It appears that apprenticeship has existed from the earliest periods of recorded history. According to Bergevin[18] the Code of Hammurabi, (circa 2100 B.C.), which is the "oldest surviving code of laws", must have been written because of conditions prevalent at that time. Laws and regulations established by custom inspired attempts to codify procedures, abolish political inequalities, and to set aright the business of apprenticeship. Bergevin

[18]Paul Bergevin, Industrial Apprenticeship, (New York and London, McGraw-Hill Company, 1947.)

has pointed out that:

> Apprenticeship reached a state of development in Egypt during the first century B.C., comparable to apprenticeship in medieval Europe. Indentures have been found in ancient Egyptian tombs, specifically outlining the relationship of apprentice and master, indicating the trade to be taught and the required period for apprenticeship.[19]

Although written records are not continuous throughout history, other existing evidence in the crafts make it reasonably certain that apprenticeship has had an uninterrupted history from the beginning of civilization. With primitive man, apprenticeship probably began as an unconscious process of imitative learning and later became incidental to learning and teaching for ordinary primitive daily existance. In early historical ages it merged into the process of craftsmen adopting sons, and later appeared as a recognized contractural relationship between craftsman and parent or master and learner.

A father usually taught his son his own occupation. This father-son relationship was a characteristic of apprenticeship throughout history until the rise of state apprenticeship in the sixteenth century. Sons were even adopted by artisans as evidenced in the Code of Hammurabi, which stated that "if an artisan has taken a son to bring up and has caused him to learn his handicraft, that nursling shall

[19] Ibid

not return to his father's house."[20] This was an accepted institution of apprenticeship in which, through the forms of adoption, a boy was indentured for life.

Babylonian and Assyrian history show apprenticing of slaves to have been common practice and there are examples of slaves who had been taught a handicraft and who were also skilled artisans. Frequently the person to whom the slave was apprenticed, was a slave himself.

In ancient Egypt no fixed period of apprenticeship was required. The terms of months or years was a matter of contract and the term differed in the same crafts. The master paid for the food and clothing of the apprentices, and wages varied according to the skill of the learners. Masters agreed to teach the apprentice the trade in return for their labor. Most contracts contained clauses on food, clothes, lodging, wages, the term of service, fines for breach of contract, taxes of apprentices, obedience to masters, lost time, obligation of the master to teach, and the observance of holidays.[21] The age at which a boy entered a contract varied considerably since there was no formal control of apprenticeship.

Apprenticeships were present during the Roman Empire. According to contracts in this era, the artisan gave trade

[20]Arthur B. Mays, Essentials of Industrial Education. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. 1952), pp. 241.

[21]Paul Monroe, A Textbook in the History of Education. (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1949), pp. 253-255.

instruction, plus other considerations, to the apprentice in turn for labor. There was no definite term of service or rate of wage; these matters again were done by contract. In Athens, scholars accepted apprenticeship as an essential factor in the economic life.

During the Dark Ages and Renaissance the monasteries played an active role in training and education. In order to live a religious life, the monks had to learn to read the Scriptures and also to copy manuscripts. Also, it was necessary for them to learn manual skills and crafts to maintain themselves.

In ancient times, apprenticeships were used not only to prepare men for handicrafts, but for all forms of industrial and professional work. Entrance into all professions was achieved through apprenticeship. Lawyers were trained by practicing attorneys in law offices, dentists and doctors were educated in a similar manner.

## II. MEDIEVAL AND EARLY ENGLISH PERIODS

In the eleventh century craft guilds appeared and, since indentured apprenticeship was a characteristic feature of the later craft guilds, it is assumed that it existed in some form among the early guilds. The craft guilds appeared slowly and did not become powerful in city affairs until the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when they seem to have superseded in importance the older merchant guilds.

As early as 1261 there are references in London regarding apprentices and apprenticeship fixing terms of service

at ten years.

The apprentice had to serve faithfully, work diligently, and make himself useful. The master obligated himself to teach the apprentice all phases of the trade, and to give him all the care due to his own son--shelter, food, clothing, and moral and religious instruction. No references were made to wages, only entrance and completion dates. Apprenticeship was expected to provide not only a good craftsman but also a good citizen.

The Medieval apprenticeship stressed personal family relationship and its success as industrial education seems to be due chiefly to this feature. Again, the worker lived his education and, for seven years, education was his life, full time education in every sense of the word. The young learner was bound out by his parents to a master craftsman and for periods up to seven years, he worked and lived with his employer.

After the enactment of the Statute of Artificers, in 1562, seven years was uniformly required as the term of indentures in England. It was also known as the Statue of Labourers and Apprentices and under it all people who exercised trades were required by law to have spent seven years, at least, as apprentices in their particular trade. There were several other important points in this Statute:

(1) The apprentice was bound by a formal written indenture. His term was fixed at seven years unless he was under seventeen years of age. If he was seventeen or older,

his apprenticeship term did not expire until he was twenty four years of age. This protected existing craftsmen from an over-supply of skilled workers in their field; provided a supply of cheap labor; and assumed complete mastery of the trade necessary before the learner would be classified as a master.

(2) Only responsible householders were permitted to take apprentices. Agreements were made only with masters who owned their own homes and businesses.

(3) Only townspeople could enter apprenticeships; country people were excluded. This favored the town boys and gave them an opportunity for a trade more profitable than agriculture.[22]

Apprenticeship was important as an effective restraining and social agency when the social and political life was not well organized. It was effective for training skilled craftsmen, and protected the guilds against the new domestic system of production. Apprenticeship, however, outlived the guilds and co-existed in the development of the factory system of production. Apprenticeship, reached a high degree of complexity and importance and became an institution of the state in the sixteenth century England and in the seventeenth century colonial North America. It passed through periods of neglect but played a major role in industrial education and is today important in training for industry.

[22] Arthur B. Mays, The Century Education Series: The Problem of Industrial Education, (New York: The Century Co., 1952), p. 299.

Even with restrictions such as high fees for freedom and rules to protect the prestige of the guild, the new domestic system of production soon all but eliminated the craft guilds.

Under the state direction the old personal relationship soon degenerated into that of employer and worker, and later to that of exploiter of the workers, both child and youth. The element of supervision almost wholly disappeared. Queen Elizabeth's famous Statute of Artificers (1562), which sought to enforce uniform restrictions on the practice of a trade in England, failed to realize its intended purposes. The Poor Law, subsequently passed, forced pauper children into apprenticeship and made available an enormous supply of cheap, unprotected child labor. Not many years after state apprenticeship and state compulsary labor for paupers supplanted guild apprenticeship, one of the worst forms of Child labor the world has ever known developed in England and later appeared in America. Industrial organization led to an ever increasing division of labor and finally, together with other economic disturbances, such as the fall of the value of money, the number of enclosures on farm lands and cheap labor, helped to make the growth of the domestic system of production easy and the enforcement of guild apprenticeship increasingly difficult. The guilds slowly receded into the background and eventually, with the establishment of colonies in distants lands, a new economic system came about and the guilds disappeared.

## III. COLONIAL AMERICAN PERIOD

The essential characteristics of the practice of apprenticeship in the American colonies were determined by English guild and municipal legislation of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Apprenticeship soon modified its character and became a means of common education as well as a method of training mechanics and a type of poor relief. The system was a complicated one, sometimes being used as a form of punishment for debt, the indenture being made out for apprenticeship instead of for servitude. As a result, indentured servants received the benefit of trade training and at other times apprentices were treated like servants.

In the colonies, most of the apprenticeship existed in the North since this section had early developed into the industrial part of the country. The indentured servant was employed in greater numbers in the South. Two classes of apprentices existed, those that were voluntary and those that were forced. The later consisted of orphans, paupers, incorrigibles, etc. Usually, the term of apprenticeship was seven years; however, there were some exceptions. It seems that there was the feeling that shorter apprenticeship might be detrimental to the crafts.

The master provided the board, lodging, and clothing and was responsible for giving the apprentice trade and general information. Frequently, the apprentice was taught how to read and write and was given some religious instruction.[23]

[23]Paul Bergevin, Industrial Apprenticeship, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book, Inc., 1947), p. 13.

Colonial and town governments assumed general supervision of the relationship of master and apprentice. This in turn brought about other laws to protect both apprentices and masters. From all this came what might be termed "state" supervised systems.

Labor needs in the factories of the colonies and an over supply of labor in England encouraged emigration to the colonies. The problem of transportation for the poor was solved with indentured servitude or apprenticeship without its educational opportunities. The servant guaranteed to work for a specific period of years for his transportation. In this situation, there were two classes of indentured servants:

(1) those who sold themselves in return for their passage or to the highest bidder upon arrival; and (2) the "free-willers" who did not sell themselves to the ship-master but engaged passage and then sold themselves into servitude upon arrival in the colonies. Most of the indentured servants taken out of England were for servitude but many were for apprenticeship. A person falling into debt could be siezed and sold into service if he were not able to pay the debts after he arrived in the colonies. All the indentured received from his master when freed was some clothing, a few bushels of corn, and a tool or two--sometimes a gun.

The coming of the factory system in the nineteenth century stemmed from the opening of Slater's (textile) mill in New England. The fact that the beginning of the factory system coincided with the laissez-faire theory of economics

served to hasten the growth of child labor and the destruction of a genuine apprenticeship. Near the end of the colonial period apprenticeship declined rapidly in importance. Regulations were relaxes with reference to the term of apprenticeship and the standards of training. It became little more than a form of cheap labor. The decline in effectiveness and popularity was due mainly to; (1) the early mills in which the trades were increasingly broken up into specialized processes that could be learned in a short time; (2) social prejudices against manufacturing occupations because of their almost invariable association with poverty and pauperism; (3) the ease with which land could be obtained and one could become an independent farmer and landowner; and (4) increasing importation of foreigners from Continental Europe who were trained in the trades.[24]

Child labor was substituted for trained workers. The economic doctrine of laissez-faire was accepted by employers. Labor organizations were weak and machines were substituted for skilled workers in the factories. The old apprenticeship had almost disappeared by 1860. Genuine apprenticeship was greatly retarded by the mistakes of labor and industry and so likewise retarded has been the solution to the problem of industrial education in the United States.

## IV. FROM THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

The advent of the American Industrial Revolution has

[24] Arthur B, Mays. The Essentials Of Industrial Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Co., Inc., 1952), p. 46.

no fixed date because of the slow transition up to the factory system. Progress varied both by industry and locale. The South remained for the most part on a handicraft basis long after the Civil War. On the "frontier", industries developed even more slowly. In the North, the factory system gained steadily during the twenties and made progress in parts of New England from 1840 to 1860. However, it was after the Civil War before its period of greatest growth began.

The power driven machinery that replaced hand tools affected the apprentice because it revolutionized his methods of work and his social status. The master's house had been his home and he worked closely with the master for which he received his board and clothing in return for his services. Industry made it impossible for the master to house all of his apprentices and so cash had to be paid in order for the apprentices to seek their own room and board. A wage earning apprentice appeared who had greater freedom, greater opportunity, but also greater possibilities of losing everything very quickly.

It was the control of apprenticeship that was one of the main reasons for the organization of some of the early unions such as the Green Glass Blowers in 1857, (and their reorganization in 1866), the German-American Typographical Union, the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, the Painters and Decorators Union, and the Union of Shoemakers known as the Knights of St. Crispin.

The question of apprenticeship became more serious with the Civil War. Military life withdrew so many men from

industry that a free use of apprentice labor seemed absolutely necessary. The expansion of the factory system after the Civil War brought increased division of labor and specialization of tasks. All around apprenticeship became still less common. Boys were not taught trades as a whole. The unions sought to regulate apprenticeship both by legislative enactment and by trade unions. The labor movement of the 1860's tried to effect the full rebuilding of apprenticeship.

Contemporaneous with the attempt to regulate apprenticeship by legislation went the attempt to regulate it by trade-union enactment and collective bargaining. At first the formulation of the rules governing apprenticeship was left largely to the local unions. This, of course, proved inadequate. A national problem could not be regulated by the uncoordinated rules of local bodies. Impotent as the local unions proved to be, the national bodies were just as slow in shouldering the responsibility for regulation.

The close of the Civil War found labor seeking legislation on apprenticeship standards. Companies once again attemped to enforce apprenticeship. Even with its many shortcomings and labor opposition, this was, at the time, a good system of general training because apprenticeship contributed annually to the wealth of the nation a large number of skilled workmen and molded the character of vast numbers who also had the ability to keep themselves gainfully employed.

Apprenticeship decreased around 1900 for economic and technological reasons as well as because of trade union regulations. However, the term "apprentice" had become so

loosely used that determination of actual bonafide apprentices was impossible to ascertain. Systems to train high-grade mechanics continued in many of the new industrial plants but became more specialized.

Bergevin mentioned that Massachusetts, Illinois and New York were leaders in state legislation on industrial education.[25]

The industrial education law, passed by the State of Wisconsin in 1911, marked the beginning of state regulation of apprenticeship by prescribing that every apprentice should receive not less than five hours a week of instruction in English, citizenship, business practice, hygiene, physiology, the use of safety devices, and such other branches as might be approved by the state board of industrial education. This law also provided for registration of all apprenticeship indentures.

In 1915 this apprenticeship law was amended to provide for: (1) compulsory indenture, (2) time for instruction in the continuation school; a minimum of five hours per week to be devoted to instruction and the employers were required to pay the apprentice for this time, (3) regulation of hours and wages; apprentices over 18 years could work overtime not to exceed 30 hours a month and were to receive for this one and one-half ordinary wage rates. (4) specification of the particular process to be taught the apprentice and approximate time to be spent on each, (5) supervision and direction of the system by the state industrial commission. This measure helped both in standardizing conditions and in offering

[25]Bergevin, Op. cit., pp. 38-40.

an incentive for the apprentice to do their best and to complete their apprenticeship.

Despite the passage of legislation designed to benefit apprenticeship, the percentage of apprentices in the total work force in the United States continued to decline.

The crash of the stock market in 1929 and the "great depression" which followed all but "dealt the death blow" to apprenticeship. With millions of trained artisans unemployed (or employed only part time) there was little incentive or opportunity to train additional workers.

However, by 1937 the scarcity of skilled labor was acute in many trades. In the meantime local and national employers, labor organizations, educators and government officials--federal, state, and local-were expressing grave concern over the future of apprenticeship. Through the combined efforts of these various interests the federal government for the first time formally participated in promoting apprenticeship and the national apprenticeship law was passed by Congress. The law, popularly known as the Fitzgerald Act, was enacted to promote the furtherance of labor standards of apprenticeship; to extend the application of such standards by encouraging the inclusion thereof in contracts of apprenticeship; to bring together employers and labor for the formulation of programs of apprenticeship and to cooperate with State agencies in the formulation of standards of apprenticeship. It was an enabling act in every sense of the word, without mandatory injunctions.

As a result of this act,[26] the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship was reorganized and enlarged to include an equal number of representives of employers and labor, in addition to a representative of the U. S. Department of Labor and the U. S. Office of Education. Also Apprentice-Training Service (now known as the Bureau of Apprenticeship) was established as the national administrative agency in the Labor Department to carry out the objectives of the law in conformance with the policies determined by the Federal Committee. Since 1937 the Bureau of Apprenticeship has co-coperated closely with employer, labor vocational schools, and others concerned in setting up and conducting apprent-iceship programs throughout American industry.[27]

[26]The Federal Committee on Apprenticeship was first created by the Secretary of Labor in 1934 to serve as the national policy recommending body on apprentice training in the United States. This committee was principally created to assume the responsibilities with respect to apprentices and their training under industrial codes formulated by the National Recovery Administration.

[27]United States Department of Labor, Apprenticeship Training, Past and Present, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1952), p. 21.

## SECTION IV

## CRAFTSMANSHIP TRAINING IN THE NAVY TODAY

As a modern apprenticeship system emerged from the haphazard learning periods of the past, there developed two related patterns of training in industrial apprenticeship:

(1) The self contained company apprenticeship school;

(2) The joint program of apprentice training conducted by company and by public schools.

Both of these modern systems are used in the Naval shore establishment, as well as combinations of the two. In common with these two programs, the Navy does all of the shop training. In states where school regulations and school funds permit, the related instruction is frequently furnished by the local school departments, either in Navy or public school classrooms.

The following is a summation of the official policy involved in the establishment of an apprenticeship program at an activity in the Navy as directed by (1) Navy Civilian Personnel Instruction, Section 410 and (2) the Federal Personnel Manual, Section 337 - 3, 4, and 5.

### I. OBJECTIVES

The Department of the Navy conducts apprentice training for the purpose of developing highly skilled, Navy-oriented journeymen thoroughly and broadly qualified in their trades, and to provide a potential source of key employees and supervisors. The Navy's apprentice training

program is designed to develop the character, personality, industry, and initiative of the apprentice, in addition to providing him with the technical skills and knowledges required in his chosen trade.

## II. BASIC CONSIDERATIONS

Apprentice training is by its nature a long range operation. It is not designed to solve immediate emergencies, and it should be insulated from transitory retrenchments that disturb the programs stability. These are the factors to be considered in planning the establishment of an apprentice training program:

(1) The number of journeymen employed in each of the trades being considered for apprenticeship;

(2) The long range estimated requirements for personnel in these trades;

(3) The local labor market conditions and trends, including the extent of availability of adequately trained journeymen on a continuing basis;

(4) The availability of training staff assistance, and qualified shop and related information instructors;

(5) The adequacy of training facilities;

(6) The scope and complexity of the workload available at the activity to assure that apprenticeses will obtain well-rounded training.

Table III, page 49 shows a list of Naval activities authorized to conduct apprentice training and the trades authorized apprenticeable at each. Naval activities




Table III - Activities Authorized to Conduct Apprentice Training by Trades, as of 15 July, 1961

(Navy Civilian Personnel Instruction 410, Section 10-14, a, p. 88. ).

employing journeymen in apprenticeable trades but not already authorized to provide training, may request authorization to establish such training if an analysis of the above indicates a need for such a program and the capacity to carry it out.

Once an activity has determined to establish an apprentice training program, it is necessary to estimate the number of apprentices that should be inducted each year. These are factors that effect this decision:

(1) The long range outlook for the workload of the activity;

(2) The requirements for journeymen in each of the apprenticeable trades considering attrition (including retirements);

(3) The number of journeymen to be obtained by means other than apprenticeship;

(4) The need for sufficient apprentices to assure an adequately trained nucleus of potential key employees and supervisors to support any necessary sudden expansion of work force in time of emergency;

(5) The probable attrition of apprentices;

(6) The number of apprentices needed in the graduating group, considering attrition among graduates;

(7) The ratio of apprentice hires to journeymen that is required to maintain apprentice training;

(8) Adjustment in the number of apprentices to be inducted for the particular year, by trades giving consideration to the anticipated need for journeymen at the close of

the four-year apprenticeship. Although there is no maximum ceiling on the number of apprentices at any one location, the minimum number should provide an input of at least 2% to 3% of the journeymen in apprenticeable trades.

## III. ORGANIZATION

It is the purpose of the Navy apprentice training program to pattern the curriculum around a mixture of shop training under qualified instructors and school instructors similarly qualified in their field. Approximately four weeks are spent in shop work for each one week spent in related training.

The training should be under the direction of an Apprentice Supervisor who preferably is a product of an apprentice school. He should have had trade experience (usually four years is sufficient); should have completed an instructor training course (30 hours); and he should have demonstrated his ability to organize trade material for instructional purposes.

Shop instructors are artisans who have served a regular apprenticeship in the trade or have obtained sufficient training otherwise to qualify them, and who have had experience in the trade they teach. A course of instruction in instructor training is also essential.

Related information instructors are most frequently obtained from the local school districts. In this case the instructor must be qualified under the school requirements as well as the apprenticeship training requirements.

The apprentice serves four years of training which will provide him with approximately 8,000 hours of shop and related information indoctrination.

## IV. SELECTION OF APPRENTICES

To be eligible for the written examination given by the Civil Service Commission, applicants for apprentice training must be between the ages of 16 to 21 years. To be eligible for appointment the applicant must pass the written examination with a grade of 70 or higher. Furthermore, to be eligible for certain trades, requiring considerable use of mathematics (such as machinist), applicants must pass an additional test in algebra and geometry. Civil Service rules for appointment are followed in selecting the desired number of apprentices. Exceptions may be made for veterans with respect to age limits and test scores.

## V. SHOP AND RELATED TRAINING

A schedule of shop training (not to be confused with related information training) is made for each apprenticeable trade. This schedule is a plan for the rotational training throughout all of the work experience the apprentice should require to become a well rounded craftsman.

The work experience plans are combined into broad areas of training according to the work performed. These areas are then systematically and progressively arranged into individual work experiences or elements. As an example, the

sewage systems would be an area of training for pipefitter. The installation, maintenance and repairing of sewage lines and equipment would be some of the elements of shop training under this one area.[28] The apprentice receives shop training four out of every five weeks. In one year he will complete 1600 hours of instruction in the shop.

The related training, which the apprentices receive during the one week in five, is a carefully organized part of the program using books, laboratories, individual lesson sheets and lectures. The related instruction consists of specific information or knowledge that is essential to the apprentice for the full mastery of his trade. These subjects include:

(1) Trade Theory

(2) Trade Mathematics

(3) Trade Science

(4) Trade drawing and Blueprint Reading

(5) Applied English

(6) Organization and Management

A total of 400 hours per year are devoted to this area, and the level of instruction will normally fall within the range of the 10th to 14th grade work.

Table IV, page 54 is a typical training plan for an Electronics Mechanic Apprentice and shows the broad allocation of time to the various areas and elements of his related information training.

[28]See Appendix C for pipefitter apprentice shop training outline, pp.129 to 133.

ELECTRONICS MECHANIC APPRENTICE TRAINING PLAN

SCHEDULE OF RELATED INFORMATION TRAINING

| SUBJECT | Total Hours | Hours Per Year of Apprenticeship | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| Trade Theory * | 648 | 168 | 168 | 160 | 152 |
| Trade Mathematics | 376 | 112 | 112 | 80 | 72 |
| Trade Science * | 160 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 96 |
| Trade Drawing and Blueprint Reading | 192 | 64 | 64 | 40 | 24 |
| Applied English | 160 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| Organization and Management | 64 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| Total Hours Scheduled | 1600 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 |

* Only enough time has been scheduled in Trade Science to cover those areas of instruction which are not a part of the Trade Theory curriculum.

Table IV - Electronics Mechanic Apprentice Training Plan

Schedule of Related Information Training

(Navy Civilian Personnel Instruction 410, Section 10-14,c,p.91)

When the number of apprentices being scheduled to receive related information training is too small to make instruction by formal classroom arrangement economically or practically feasible, another plan, such as one of the following, can be adopted: (1) combined-course training for a group of allied trades; (2) supervised study basis; (3) correspondence courses; or (4) use of a nearby U. S. Government facility or use of a non-Government facility.

## VI. APPRENTICE PROMOTION POLICY

Every apprentice upon entering on duty is rated as apprentice in the trade he is studying (i.e. apprentice pipefitter) and he is assigned a class, such as fourth class through first class. A beginning pipefitter trainee would then be classified apprentice pipefitter fourth class and would be promoted through the four classes yearly as he completes his necessary training. This normally will require the full 1600 hours of shop work and 400 hours of related training for each years advancement.

Unsatisfactory performance of apprentices is handled in accordance with Civilian Personnel Instruction (230.10) which states that an apprentice may be dropped if he has two unsatisfactory quarterly grades in any one year.

Advanced training is also encouraged and apprentices who demonstrate superior ability may be permitted to spend part of their time in engineering, planning and production control. Advanced credit earned before entering apprentice training may be allowed up to a maximum of two years. The

Navy Department requires each apprentice to complete satisfactorily at least two full years in active Navy apprenticeship, including specific application of his selected trade within the Navy before he will be eligible to receive a Navy apprenticeship certificate.[29]

[29] See Fig. 9. p. 57.

# Department of the Navy

## Certificate of Apprenticeship

is certified as having fulfilled the requirements of apprenticeship under standards prescribed by the Department of the Navy, and is qualified as a skilled journeyman

and entitled to all rights and privileges pertaining thereto.

Witness our signatures this ____ day of _____ 19____

PLACE ACTIVITY SEAL HERE

| | |
|---|---|
| _____ SENIOR CIVILIAN SUPERVISOR | _____ COMMANDING |
| _____ SENIOR TRAINING OFFICIAL | _____ ACTIVITY |

Fig. 9 - Naval Apprentice Graduate Certificate

(Navy Civilian Personnel Instruction 410, Section 10 - 14, g, p. 97.)

## SECTION VI

## FINDINGS

This section presents the findings of the questionnaire survey conducted, review of the literature and data collected through interviews or correspondence.

### I. VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF DATA

The questionnaire response was excellent. Of the 162 activities requested to participate in the survey, 117 replied.[30] Data was supplied by 100 activities. The other 17 activities that replied consisted of: (1) Activities whose public work functions had been or were in the process of transferring to other activities; (2) Activities with no civilian employment; (3) Activities not desiring to participate in the survey either due to the considerable effort required to collect the data or because they did not consider the survey of value.

The 100 activities providing the data varied over a wide range with respect to the number of journeymen employed. For purposes of analysis, they were divided into four equal groups of 25 activities each:

Group No. 1 - 10 to 37 journeymen per activity

Group No. 2 - 37 to 95 journeymen per activity

Group No. 3 - 97 to 189 journeymen per activity

Group No. 4 - 195 to 705 journeymen per activity

A total of 13,275 journeymen are reported on by this study -

[30] See Appendix A for a complete listing of replying activities, pp.97 to 108.

a total estimated by the writers to be approximately 50% of all public works craftsmen employed by the Navy within the continental United States and Hawaii.

Wide distribution was also achieved geographically and by type of activity. Ten general categories of activities are represented as shown by Table V, page 60. Most represented are Naval Air Stations - 31%. All activity types are represented in more than one group except Naval Communications Activities (small by nature) and Public Works Centers (large by nature). Geographically, at least 10 states and 5 areas are represented in each group as shown by Table VI, page 61. The state with the most activities is California whereas the most represented area consists of the Southern States. In total, 28 states and the District of Columbia are represented.

## II. THE PROBLEM OF AGE

The Department of Labor has conducted an extensive survey of man-power needs projected through 1970.[31] Concern was expressed over the fact that 41% of the nation's skilled craftsmen were over 45 years of age and that this percent was expected to remain at this high level through the 1960's. Question two of the questionnaire conducted as a part of this study requested a count of journeymen by five year age groups.[32] The findings as shown by Figure 10, page 62 were:

[31] U. S. Department of Labor, Manpower: Challenge of the 1960s, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1959), p. 18.

[32] See Appendix B for basic data, pp. 109 to 113.

TABLE V - REPLIES BY TYPE OF ACTIVITY

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Total |
| 1. | Personnel/Training Activity | 3 | | 1 | 7 |
| 2. | Supply Center or Depot | | | | 9 |
| 3. | Research/Development Activity | | | | 9 |
| 4. | Admin/Operational Activity | | | | 9 |
| 5. | Communications Activity | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 6. | Air Station | 6 | | 6 | 31 |
| 7. | Hospital | | | | 7 |
| 8. | Ammunition Depot/Production Plant | | | | |
| 9. | Shipyard | | | | |
| 10. | Public Works Center | | | | |
| | Total | | | | |

TABLE VI - Geographical Distribution of Replies

| | GROUPS | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Total |
| Hawaii | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Pacific Coast States | 2 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 27 |
| Mountain States | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Southwest States | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Midwest States | 3 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 9 |
| Southern States | 8 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 30 |
| Northeast States | 8 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 20 |
| District of Columbia | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Total | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 100 |
| Number of States Represented | 18 | 14 | 16 | 10 | 58 |




| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Group 1 - - - 0.2 % | 0.5 % | 5.1 % | 11.8 % | 19.5 % | 22.9 % | 15.0 % | 13.8 % | 11.2 % |
| Group 2 —·— 0.3 % | 1.7 % | 5.7 % | 12.2 % | 21.3 % | 21.9 % | 13.8 % | 12.5 % | 10.6 % |
| Group 3 —·· 0.4 % | 1.1 % | 4.4 % | 11.5.% | 20.8 % | 20.8 % | 15.9 % | 13.1 % | 11.9 % |
| Group 4 —···0.2 % | 1.0 % | 4.1 % | 10.0 % | 19.5 % | 21.4 % | 17.9 % | 13.1 % | 12.8 % |
| Total Average .3 % | 1.1 % | 4.4 % | 10.8 % | 20.1 % | 21.4 % | 16.8 % | 13.0 % | 12.1 % |

Fig. 10 JOURNEYMEN BY AGE GROUPS

1. Percent of craftsman over 45 years of age- 63.3%

2. Percent of craftsmen over 40 years of age- 83.4%

3. Percent of craftsmen under 30 years of age- 1.4%

4. Age distribution did not vary by activity size.

The following excerpts from survey participating activities correspondence examplifies the concern at the operating levels:

> From available statistics, 90% of the per diem personnel in this department are over 40 years of age and most of these have 15 or more years of service---The problem of providing future journeymen is becoming increasingly critical---Due to the high average age of personnel an apprentice program is highly desirable--You will note that our average and median ages are both 51 years. Unless we can be more successful in pumping in new blood, we will have a real problem as our work force ages.---The main problem from a labor force standpoint is to obtain younger men, since over half of our force exceeds 50 years in age. Almost a third of the men are 55 or over. This condition has resulted primarily from World War 11 hiring of older men plus severe reduction in forces over the years. The younger men have been vulnerable to such RIFs.-- The majority of our personnel entered Federal service in World War 11.---It is to be noted that the figures are based on journeymen only and do not include supervisors. If supervisors had been included, the average age of the shop personnel would be much higher.

## III. THE PROBLEM OF ATTRITION

In 1959 a national study of journeymen losses was completed by Kaylor and Hamburger which appears in their book, Education For An Industrial Age. Their findings were that the average tenure of a journeyman is 28 years and that the annual losses due to retirement, disability and death is 3.6%. They also concluded that this journeyman loss rate would be valid for the near future. The rate is currently accepted by the California Apprenticeship Council as

realistic. Question three of the questionnaire conducted as a part of this study requested a projection of anticipated journeymen losses by fiscal year, between 1965 and 1969. The findings as shown by Figure 11, page 65 were:

1. The average annual journeymen loss for the total population was 9.5%.

2. The total anticipated losses over the five year period were projected at 47.6% in a population 13,275.

3. The loss rate steadily increased with time for Groups No. 1, 2 and 3, whereas it decreased slightly for Group 4.

4. The average loss rate for Group No. 3 and 4 was considerably higher for all periods than that of Groups No. 1 and 2.

A number of activities were subsequently requested to verify the extremely high loss rate reported. The following are excerpts from their replies:

> During first two years of operation (FY 62, FY 63), Public Works lost 44 employees.---We anticipate losing a substantial percent of our journeymen in the next five years. This is largely attributable to reductions in forces, imposed between 1959 and 1962, which removed all but our most senior employees.---We have practically no input of young men because the local area offers very little future in growth, pay scales in general are low and the young people leave the area.--We find that we have been, and continue to be forced with a spri ing retirement rate as evidence by the number of journeymen indicated.---Fiscal Year 1965 may show an increase in separations equal to or exceeding Fiscal Year 1963.--- At present our average age in all ungraded positions in Shop Division has been high resulting in over 60 retirements in the past year. Add to this other causes for separation, makes our attrition rate run to 85 for the year.

Even with substantiations as stated above, the loss rates as shown were based only on the activities whose data




| | FY65 | FY66 | FY67 | FY68 | FY69 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Group 1 | 5.6 % | 6.5 % | 6.9 % | 6.9 % | 7.7 % |
| Group 2 | 6.6 % | 7.0 % | 6.6 % | 7.3 % | 7.5 % |
| Group 3 | 9.1 % | 9.9 % | 10.0 % | 10.4 % | 11.1 % |
| Group 4 | 10.3 % | 10.4 % | 10.0 % | 9.5 % | 9.8 % |
| Average | 7.9% | 8.4% | 8.5% | 8.5% | 8.8% |

Fig. 11 EXPECTED LOSSES FISCAL YEARS 1965-69

was within ± 2 standard deviations of the mean loss rates for their respective groups. This resulted in more conservative rates than would have otherwise been shown.[33] In doing so, data from five activities was excluded. Their respective total loss rate for the next five years were 100%, 87.5%, 115.4%, 113.2%, and 155.0%.

## IV. THE PROBLEM OF RECRUITMENT

Section IV attempted to show that historically, concern of lack of technically trained craftsmen has had a tendency to cycle. In fact, it would appear that this cycle parallels the duration of various technological ages or periods in general. The late 1930s was the last period, prior to recent years, in which concern over the lack of craftsmanship training gained national prominence.

Just how serious is the problem today? Figure 12, page 67 shows the expected rate of growth of the major industries in the United States during the 1960s. It is noted that the construction industry is expected to expand almost twice as fast as industry in general. The construction industry is the major consumer and competition for the majority of journeymen in the trades this paper is concerned with (i.e. Electricians, Carpenters, Plumbers etc.) Automation is slowly turning the manufacturing industry into factories of automated equipment and maintenance craftsmen(i.e., Machinists, Refrigeration and Air-conditioning Mechanics, Heavy Duty Equipment Mechanics etc.)

[33]See Appendix B for basic data, pp. 114 to 117.




Fig. 12 - Expected Growth Rate During the 1960s

(U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Challenge of the 1960s, Washington; Government Printing Office, 1959, p. 9)

This, of course, is not necessarily a problem if apprentice training is expanding at an equal rate, both in and outside the Navy. Unfortunately it is not. Construction trades apprentice program graduates have declined as follows:

| 1954 | 1956 | 1958 | 1960 | 1962 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 156,000 | 112,619 | 108,814 | 102,963 | 100,751 |

The U. S. Labor Department's Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training states that one of the most important of the basic trades, Carpenters, is graduating so few apprentices that it can replace only 14% of the journeymen lost through deaths and retirements and will be able to supply fewer than 5% of the additional Carpenters the future growth of industry will require. The same report stated . . . "the construction industry as a whole is producing through apprenticeship only 10% of the additional journeymen it will need by 1970."[34]

In the midst of a general slump in apprentice training, the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters and the National Construction Association have awarded $269,150 to 29 local unions for training. The educational training program of the U. A. is one of the largest and most elaborate of any trade union in the nation. But the union is barely holding its own in the number of apprentices enrolled.[35]

[34] Engineering News Reports, "Carpenters Face Shortage of Journeymen", 169: 74, December 13, 1962.

[35] Engineering News Record, "Training; A Dommed Crusade?" 162: 102, March 26, 1959.

The writers have included an extensive bibliography with this paper. Most of the periodical articles are repititious with concern over the above problem and every basic trade is included.

Question seven of the questionnaire conducted as a part of this study requested a ranking of the method of recruiting journeymen. This data [36] was then assigned a weight equal to the journeymen population of the activity. From this the present recruitment sources were determined percentagewise for total population and each group. The findings as shown by Figure 13, page 70 were:

1. Apprentice programs provided only 10.7% of journeymen at present.

2. Only 47.6% of all journeymen recruited have been formally trained.

3. The above percentages improve (increase) as the activity's journeymen population increases.

4. There is a 7% preference to promoting journeymen helpers to recruiting personnel with general experience.

5. Although 52.4% of personnel being recruited into the journeyman category have not received formal training, there is a surprising lack of concern. The reason is apparent and is discussed in the following subsection.

## V. THE PROBLEM OF SUB SPECIALIZATION

An article in Engineering News Report in December 1962 pointed out a problem developing from the shortage of fully

[36] See Appendix B for basic data, pp.118 to 121.




| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Group 1 ——— | 1.3 % | 35.1 % | 36.0 % | 27.6 % |
| Group 2 — — | 1.5 % | 33.9 % | 40.3 % | 24.3 % |
| Group 3 —·— | 5.7 % | 28.2 % | 37.4 % | 28.7 % |
| Group 4 —··— | 15.1 % | 29.2 % | 36.2 % | 19.5 % |
| Average ——— | 5.9% | 31.6% | 37.5% | 25.0% |

Fig. 13 METHOD OF RECRUITMENT

qualified (apprentice trained) journeymen which can be seen on an increasing scale today. It stated, "More attention must be paid to rotation of apprentices to prevent specialization...The development of apprenticeship and its successful operation has been hampered, for example, by the growth of specialty subs for such work as flooring and roofing..." Question four of the questionnaire conducted as a part of this study requested a count of journeymen by specific trade. As shown by Table VII, page 72 and Figure 14, page 73, 15 trades constituted 65.8% of the total population.

Sub specialization in lieu of fully trained craftsmen was very apparent.[37] For example, activities with the classification of Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Mechanic also reported personnel classified as Refrigeration Mechanic, Air Conditioning Mechanic, Dehumidification Mechanics etc. Activities reporting pipefitters also reported sprinkler system mechanics. Many activities, as per the initial example stated, had in addition to carpenters - roofers, joiners, cabinetmakers, wood and plastic workers, linoleum layers etc. This increasing subdivision of basic trades both within and without the Navy is symptomatic of decreasing availability of the well trained journeyman in the basic trades. In particular, the activities with small numbers of journeymen can ill afford the loss of flexibility and consequently the loss in productivity that goes with subdividing basic crafts into semiskilled classifications.

[37] See Appendix B for a complete listing of crafts, trades and classifications reported, pp. 122 to 124.

| Group | Electrician | Carpenter | Painter | Plumber | Auto Mechanic | Refer & A/C | Pipefitter | Machinist | Sheetmetal | Hv Duty Mech. | Welder | Maint. Man | Enginemen | Rigger | Mach. Maint. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 120 | 103 | 75 | 82 | 27 | 22 | 19 | 16 | 10 | 19 | 7 | 32 | 5 | 9 | 5 |
| 2 | 247 | 198 | 154 | 142 | 83 | 66 | 34 | 75 | 42 | 28 | 29 | 36 | 5 | 25 | 13 |
| 3 | 483 | 335 | 294 | 284 | 89 | 100 | 143 | 79 | 77 | 49 | 63 | 84 | 10 | 38 | 78 |
| 4 | 1078 | 649 | 691 | 515 | 346 | 258 | 242 | 170 | 188 | 132 | 116 | 62 | 174 | 112 | 76 |
| Total | 1928 | 1285 | 1214 | 1023 | 545 | 446 | 438 | 340 | 316 | 228 | 215 | 214 | 194 | 184 | 172 |
| | 14.5% | 9.7% | 9.1% | 7.7% | 4.1% | 3.4% | 3.3% | 2.6% | 2.4% | 1.7% | 1.6% | 1.6% | 1.5% | 1.4% | 1.3% |

Table VII - Number of Journeymen by Trades




| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GROUP 1 - - - - | 18.6% | 15.9% | 11.6% | 12.7% | 4.1% | 3.4% | 2.9% | 2.5% | 1.5% | 2.9% | 1.1% | 5.0% | 0.8% | 1.4% | 0.8% |
| Group 2 — · — | 16.6 | 13.3 | 10.3 | 9.5 | 5.6 | 4.4 | 2.3 | 5.0 | 2.8 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 0.9 |
| Group 3 — — · | 14.5 | 10.0 | 8.8 | 8.5 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 4.3 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 2.5 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 2.3 |
| Group 4 — · · | 13.8 | 8.3 | 8.9 | 6.6 | 4.4 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 2.2 | 1.4 | 1.0 |
| Average ——— | 14.5 | 9.7 | 9.1 | 7.7 | 4.1 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.3 |

Fog. 14 JOURNEYMEN BY TRADES

A recent study by the Division of Apprenticeship Standards of the State of California indicated a 60% increase in productivity, a 67% decrease in turnover and a 70% decrease in absenteeism of the apprentice trained qualified craftsman compared to semiskilled and unskilled labor.[38]

A comparison of the training received by a pipefitter apprentice as shown on Appendix C pages 129 to 133 and the list of the pipefitter sub crafts reported, as shown on Appendix B, page 122 makes apparent that the basic crafts are being subdivided into semiskilled classifications. This in turn requires more personnel if total craft knowledge and experience is to be available.

## VI. THE PROBLEM OF TRAINING AVAILABILITY

The Department of Labor, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training conducted a pilot study of industrial training in the Trenton, New Jersey area during the first calendar quarter of 1959. The purpose of this survey of some 570 establishments employing four or more workers was to develop and test procedures to be used by the Bureau in a nation-wide study of training in industry. Mercer County was selected because of its wide variety of industrial activity. One of the results of that survey showed that the smaller an establishment the more likely it had apprentices. The results were as follows:[39]

[38] See Figure 15, p. 75.

[39] Department of Labor, A Look At Industrial Training In Mercer Coutny, New Jersey, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1959) p. 21.




Fig. 15 - Productivity Results of Apprentice Training

(State of California, Craftsmanship Through Apprenticeship, 1963)

| | Size of Firm (Craftsmen) | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 4 - 19 | 20 - 99 | 100 - over |
| No. of Firms Having Building or Metalworking Apprentice Programs. | 115 | 69 | 47 |

Question five of the questionnaire conducted as a part of this study requested that activities having an apprentice program so indicate and that each trade apprenticed and its duration be provided. The findings as shown by Tables VIII and IX, pages 77 and 78 were:

1. The smaller an activity the less likely it had ap- apprentices. (Absolute reverse of the Mercer Study).
2. A total of 18% of the activities operate apprentice programs.
3. All programs were of a four year duration.

The above contradiction of the correlation between organizational size and active apprenticeship training is due in part to the lack of flexibility with respect to training apprentices in the Navy. The following statement by Dr. John S. McCauley, Chief of Research of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, U. S. Department of Labor, shows how small organizations outside the Federal Government are solving the problem:[40]

> In sharp contrast to the large corporation, the small establishment often lacks the necessary resources to conduct planned training without outside help.[41] Since 98% of the business establishments in this country are

[40] Louis Ruthenburg, Personnel, "The Crisis In Apprentice Training," July, 1959, p. 32.

[41] Lack of funds or personnel allowances was cited by practically all activities as the reason for not operating an apprentice program.

Table VIII - TRADES PRESENTLY BEING APPRENTICED

| ACTIVITY NUMBER | Electrician | Machinist | Painter | Pipefitter | Carpenter | Electronics Mech. | Plumber | Welder | Refer. & A/C | Sheetmetal | Mach. Maint. | Auto. Mech. | Elec.(PowerPl.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21 | x | x | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | | | x | x | | | | | | | | | |
| 56 | x | x | | | x | x | x | x | | | | | |
| 59 | x | | | | | | | | x | | | | |
| 67 | x | | | x | | | x | | x | | x | | |
| 72 | x | | | | x | | x | | | x | x | | |
| 76 | x | x | | | x | | | | | | | | |
| 82 | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | | | |
| 83 | x | | | x | x | | | | x | x | | | |
| 85 | x | | | | x | | x | | | | | | |
| 89 | x | x | | x | x | | x | | x | x | | | |
| 92 | x | x | | | x | x | | | | | | x | |
| 93 | | | | | | | | | | | | | x |
| 95 | | | | | | | x | | | | | x | x |
| 96 | x | | | | x | | | | | | | | |
| 97 | | | | | | | | | | | | | x |
| 99 | x | x | | | | x | x | | | x | | | |
| 100 * | x | x | x | x | x | | | | x | x | | | x |
| Total | 14 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 |

* Note: Activity 100 also apprentices (1) boilermaker (2) joiner (3)plasterer (4) wharfbuilder (5)brickand stone mason (6) H.D. Mechanic

Table IX - Type of Activity With Apprentice Program

| Activity Number | Research/Development Activity | Air Station | Supply Center/Depot | Ordnance Depot/ Production Plant | Shipyard | Admin/ Operational | Public Works Center |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21 | x | | | | | | |
| 29 | | x | | | | | |
| 56 | | | x | | | | |
| 58 | | | | | | | |
| 59 | | | | x | | | |
| 63 | | | | | x | | |
| 67 | | | x | | x | | |
| 69 | | | | | | | |
| 72 | x | | | | x | | |
| 73 | | | x | | | | |
| 76 | | x | | | | | |
| 82 | | | | | | x | |
| 83 | | | | x | | | |
| 85 | | x | | | | | |
| 89 | | x | | | | | |
| 92 | | x | | | | | |
| 93 | | | | | x | | |
| 95 | | | | | x | | |
| 96 | | x | | | | | |
| 97 | | | | | x | | |
| 99 | x | | | | | | |
| 100 | | | | | | | x |
| Total | 3 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 |

small firms employing fewer than 100 workers,[42] this is an important factor in the national training picture. To organize effective training, small firms frequently require assistance of the government apprenticeship agencies,[43] vocational schools, and community organizations.

A promising development for the small firm is the growth of community-wide training programs in which two or more establishments participate jointly. Such programs enable a group of employers usually in cooperation with a labor union to accomplish together what many would be unable to do individually.

About 6,000 community-wide apprenticeship committees have been established throughout the country. Each of these committees sponsors an apprenticeship program in a single trade or group of related trades in which an average of approximately 25 employees participate. As a rule, apprenticeship committees have six members, three representing management and three organized labor. The committee plans apprenticeship programs, select apprentices, and determine when each apprentice has completed his term of training satisfactorily. Some committees also have organized special training programs to keep journeymen abreast of technological changes.

There seems to be no reason why the organization that cannot undertake a training program of its own should not take advantage of these facilities. The fact that this is not being done on a large enough scale is a clear indication that management, by and large, is not sufficiently aware of the urgency of the program.

Question six of the questionnaire attempted to determine interest and participation at the activity level in formal skill updating programs. The results as shown by Table X, page 80 were:

[42] 52% of the activities in this study.

[43] Although excellent Federal, State, and city apprenticeship agencies exist throughout the nation and <u>are willing</u> to assist in developing apprentice programs, Naval Activities are <u>forbidden</u> to even discuss <u>any</u> aspect of apprenticeship training with them directly. See N.C.P.I. 410, paragraph 10-3. The writers verified the above by personal interviews at activities and state and local agencies.

ACTIVITIES UTILIZING SKILL UPDATING

Table X - SOURCES OF TRAINING

| Activity Number | Manufactoring or Industry | Local School | Same Activity | Other Activity |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | x | | | |
| 5 | x | | | |
| 7 | | x | | |
| 9 | | | x | |
| 15 | | x | | |
| 21 | | x | | |
| 26 | | x | | |
| 31 | x | | | |
| 35 | | | x | |
| 45 | | x | | |
| 50 | | x | x | |
| 53 | | x | | |
| 55 | | | x | |
| 57 | | x | | |
| 58 | x | x | x | |
| 59 | x | x | | x |
| 63 | x | x | x | |
| 66 | x | x | | |
| 68 | | x | | x |
| 70 | | x | | |
| 71 | | | x | |
| 72 | | x | | x |
| 73 | | x | | |
| 81 | | x | | |
| 83 | | | x | |
| 90 | | x | | |
| 91 | | x | x | |
| 92 | | | x | |
| 93 | | | x | |
| 94 | x | | x | |
| 96 | | x | x | |
| 97 | x | x | | x |
| 98 | | | | x |
| 99 | | x | | |
| 100 | | x | x | |
| Total | 9 | 23 | 14 | 5 |

1. Twenty three percent of the activities encouraged their journeymen to take courses offered by local trade schools or at least were aware of their existance.
2. Approximately 25% of the activities in Group 1 and 2 and 50% of Group 3 and 4 were aware of skill updating programs in their vicinity.

A number of activities stated that no such programs existed near their activity, whereas, other activities located in the same area listed numerous schools and manufacturers that were providing courses. Several activities considered safety talks required enough time out of the work schedule without wasting additional time on training. At the same time, there is an increasing awareness outside the Navy to update skills in this era of rapidly changing technology. The following is only one example of many recent programs to update skills that appear to be passing the Navy by:

> A desire by unions and contractors to keep Electricians and Plumbers and Pipefitters attuned with their technologically fast-moving industries is the main motivation behind skill improvement training. When the National Joint Pipefitter Apprenticeship Committee on March 30, 1960, increased the classroom training requirements. . . the committee cited new technological advances in its industry as the reason. Glass and plastic pipe installing, silver soldering in large pneumatic control devices, and inert-gas shielded arc welding are examples of this new technology, and the plumber and pipefitter journeymen need to train for such operations as much as the apprentices. Similarly, the I.B.E.W. (International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers) maintains that the 'heart of automation' lies in the electrical industry, and its officers realize that journeymen training must reach a level at which

it can keep the craftsmen familiar with the new and changing working methods in cable splicing, welding, and electronics.[44]

[44] Department of Labor, Monthly Labor Review, "Retraining the Unemployed, Part III, Skill Improvement training For Electricians and Plumbers", October 1963, p. 1075.

# SECTION VII

# SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## I. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It has been the purpose of this paper to investigate the present status of formalized training facilities maintenance craftsmen in the Navy; further, to determine if a problem exists or can be expected to develop in the future.

The approach to the problem was to conduct a questionnaire survey of Naval activities in the continental United States and compare the data received with current comparable data of non-government industry using the same skills. This was accomplished by reviewing the literature, correspondence, and personal interviews.

Section III estab lished that the maintenance condition of the Shore Establishment is deteriorating as indicated by the large and increasing backlog of essential maintenance. It was shown that this backlog was due to insufficient maintenance funds in relation to the size, age and composition of facilities. Significant management improvements have been devised and implemented which have somewhat arrested the spiraling rise in the quantity of deferred maintenance work. These improvements have consisted primarily of management techniques and/or programs combined with consolidation of work forces into larger organizations. In the last decade, these management controls have increased efficiency 34% but recently have stayed level. This improvement represents about the maximum increase in productivity that can be expected unless more modern work methods and

more productive, better trained journeymen are employed.

Section IV developed a historical analysis of apprenticeship from the Code of Hammurabi, the oldest surviving code of laws, to the codification of the National Apprenticeship Act of 1937. From antiquity, through the Elizabethan eras, onward through the Colonial American period and beyond the Industrial Revolution, the social framework of apprenticeship was reshaped to fit the society. But the essence of apprenticeship did not change - the master craftsman, like the medical doctor, developed knowledge and skill through years of serious study and internship. It is the accumulation of knowledge acquired through hard study that separates the journeyman from the semi-skilled. Of primary importance in this historical analysis was the attempt to show that a society's or nation's interest in the formal training of craftsmen has a tendency to reappear through the ages. It does so at those moments in history when technological break-throughs or socialogical needs of a nation require ever increaseing skills and find that they are being plied by ever decreasing numbers of apprentice trained craftsmen. Such a time exists at the present.

Section V described the objectives, basic considerations and organization format used in developing an apprenticeship program in the Navy today. Methods of selecting apprentices and types of training, shop and related, are outlined as is the in-training promotion policy. Where the program is in operation it works well, except that no special recognition with respect to job protection or pay

is given the formally trained journeyman versus the journeyman with just general experience. Consequently, other than personal satisfaction in knowing how to perform at a higher quantity and quality level, there is little incentive to devote four years to hard study.

Section VI provides a comparative analysis of the current status of Naval facilities maintenance personnel to their contemporaries in private industry. The conclusions drawn from those findings are:

1. The problem of age - The Navy, through its hiring and reduction in force practices, has shaped a work force composed of old and middle aged journeymen. The seniority system has retained the older workers and has discouraged new hires, with the result that the Navy has 54% more personnel over 45 years of age than private industry in comparable journeymen categories. Of the 13,000 journeymen included in the survey, 83.4% were over 40 years old while only 1.4% were under 30 years of age.

2. The problem of Attrition - The loss rate of journeymen in the next 5 fiscal years (1965-1969), due to all causes, will be 264% higher than the national average for private industry in comparable journeymen categories. This constitutes 47% of the present work force. From inspection of the age distributions, it would appear that the problem will become even more acute after 1969.

3. The problem of recruitment - At present, only 10.7% of the journeymen are Navy apprentice trained. Almost 60%

are hired from the labor market where apprentice programs are currently projected to produce only 10% of the craftsmen required by the nation by 1970. It appears that those organizations that do not train their own personnel will go without in the very near future. In addition, the Navy can expect increasing criticism from private industry if they continue to let others bear the burden of paying for the training of craftsmen who are then hired by the Navy.

4. The problem of sub specialization - Many activities are subdividing crafts into semi-skilled jobs that can be learned without formal training. This, of course, requires more personnel and more supervision and results in a substantial decrease in productivity and flexibility at the very time when the opposite is desired. Due to the shortage of trained journeymen, this trend has been noted in private industry and an attempt to reverse the situation is being made.

5. The problem of training availability - The smaller an activity in the Navy the less likely it is to have an apprentice program. The opposite is true in private industry. The difference is that small companies and unions are assisted locally by government apprenticeship organizations to develop an apprentice program by grouping together and sharing costs. Navy activities, for reasons unknown to the writers, are not allowed to join such programs. Therefore, only very large activities can support such a program and even these are at a disadvantage in that no specific funds or personnel ceilings are provided. This

has had the bizarre effect at some air stations and shipyards of public works departments not participating in their own activity's apprenticeship program - even though in need of the trained journeymen.

The effort to update skills of journeymen at Naval Activities appears to vary widely. Those that are doing so are using several approaches which range from encouraging personnel to attend local trade school night courses to sending employees to industry schools (i.e. General Motors automotive mechanic schools, York Institute for air conditioning and refrigeration, etc.). Also, updating is accomplished by activity training, correspondence courses and in conjunction with other activities. Unfortunately, due to lack of guidance and non-recognition of the need, the majority of activities are doing nothing in this problem area.

## II. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations, based on the data, findings and conclusions reached in this study, are believed to be necessary if the Navy is to adequately maintain the Shore Establishment at a reasonable cost in the future.

1. Further consolidation of Public Works Departments into larger units should be encouraged. The expected decrease in total numbers of journeymen as a result will help alleviate the coming attrition crisis due to a skewed age distribution. Also, larger organizations are more suited to supporting apprentice training programs "in house".

2. The Bureau of Yards and Docks should actively support updating of skills. What training is available, and where, must be made known. The District Public Works organizations could develop and promulgate such information to activities and their own contract inspection personnel, who in some cases have an even greater need to update their knowledge of modern construction techniques. The cost of this recommendation is minor and the potential is substantial.

3. Where consolidation of Public Works organizations is not feasible, activities should be permitted to participate with local industry and apprentice councils in training apprentices. Much assistance is available at the local level if activities were permitted and encouraged to use it.

4. Special funding and personnel allowance must be made available to activities. It is illogical to expect local Cammanding Officers, who serve at an activity for 2 or 3 years, to use substantial maintenance funds and personnel allowance for the development of an apprentice program. Even those who are concerned are often not aware of the rapidly disappearing supply of journeymen from the labor market.

5. A distinction should be made between the true journeyman - "one who has served an apprenticeship in a trade or craft," and the individual with general experience. The distinction should be by job classification and pay scale.

6. Journeymen classification should be rigidly controlled to prevent them being subdivided into semi-skilled jobs. Where subdivision is practical, they should be recognized as semi-skills, and not journeymen classifications.

7. Above all, it is essential to begin now to develop an input of trained craftsmen to off-set the anticipated loss of almost half the journeymen now employed in the next five years. This is no small order. It will require funds, personnel and technical direction. This direction should come from the Bureau of Yards and Docks, who is at present being judged on the performance of these journeymen. On 14 February of this year, the Chief of BUDOCKS stated, "After all, in the end, our effort should be directed toward supporting the man with the tools, the many people in the far flung shore activities of the Navy. The results of our stewardship in the facilities management field are going to be judged by the blue collar worker that they come in contact with. So keep in mind this objective in conducting your own program. Increase the productivity of the blue collar worker, the man with the tools." It is hoped that this study will help that objective come true.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## A. BOOKS


1. 1. Bergevin, Paul Emile. Industrial Apprenticeship. New York and London: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1947.

2. Mays, Arthur B. Essentials of Industrial Education. New York McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952.

3. _____. Principles and Practices of Vocational Education. First Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Company Inc., 1948.

4. _____. The Problem of Industrial Education. New York: The Century Co., 1927.

5. Miller, Elmo, and Jerome W. Blood (ed.). Modern Maintenance Management. American Management Association Inc. N. Y. 1963.

6. Monroe, Paul. A Textbook in the History of Education. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1949.

7. Patterson, William F. and M. H. Hedges. Educating for Industry. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1946.


## B. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS


1. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Industrial Retraining Progress for Technological change. 1368, of 1963.

2. Department of the Navy. "Training of Apprentices", Navy Civilian Personnel Instruction 410, Section 10. 30 January 1962.

3. Department of the Navy. "Facilities Management Study", Review of Management of the Department of the Navy. Vol. 11, Study 6. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962.

4. Department of the Navy. Bureau of Yards and Docks. Civil Engineer Corps Directory, NAVDOCKS-P-1, May, 1963. Washington: Government printing Office, 1963.

5. _____. Bureau of Yards and Docks. Maintenance Management of Public Works and Public Utilities, P-231, 1959. Washington: Government Printing Office.

6. _____. Bureau of Yards and Docks. Organization and Functions for Public Works Departments, NAVDOCKS P-318, November 1960. Washington: Government Printing Office.

7. _____. Bureau of Yards and Docks. Work Improvements for Maintenance of Public Works and Public Utilities, Vol. I, Introduction and Lesson Plans, NAVDOCKS P-324, Oct. 1960. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

8. _____. Bureau of Yards and Docks. Work Improvements for Maintenance of Public Works and Public Utilities, Vol. II, Procedures and Uses, NAVDOCKS P-324, Oct. 1960. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

9. _____. Secretary of Defense. DOD Directive 4165.9 of 23 June 1955. Subj: Programs for Management of Real Property Maintenance Activities.

10. _____. Secretary of the Navy. SECNAV Instruction 11011.5 of 21 Oct. 1954. Subj: Objectives and Policies Relating to Real Property Maintenance and Utilities Operation Program.

11. _____. Secretary of the Navy. SECNAV Instruction 11014.3 of 29 June 1955. Subj: Programs for Management of Real Property Maintenance Activities.

12. _____. Secretary of the Navy. SECNAV Instruction 11014.7 of 21 February 1958. Subj: Maintenance Management of Public Works and Public Utilities.

13. Hanna, Charles F. Employment and Manpower. Statement before United States Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower. October 18, 1963.

14. National Association of Manufacturers. Your Opportunities in Industry as a Skilled Craftsman. New York: Educational Dept. February 1957.

15. New York State Department of Labor Apprenticeship Council. Apprenticeship in New York State. 1948.

16. State of California. Division of Apprenticeship Standards. A Study and Comparison of California Apprenticeship Completions and Journeymen Losses with National Completions and Losses. Mimeographed material. 1958.

17. _____. Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Apprenticeship Standards. A Survey of Apprenticeship in Metal Trades, in Manufacturing and Aircraft Industry. California State Printing Office, 1959.

18. _____. Department of Industrial Relations. Division of Apprenticeship Standards. Craftsmanship Through Apprenticeship. California State Printing Office, 1960.

19 _____. Department of Industrial Relations. California Conference on Apprenticeship, April 1962. Mimeographed Material.

20. _____. Division of Apprenticeship Standards. Survey of Completed Apprentices. California State Printing Office, 1962.

21. The 42 Northern California Counties Carpenters. Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committees. A Handbook For Carpenter Apprentices. 1963 - 1964 Edition. Santa Rosa, California

22. United States Civil Service Commission. Assessing and Reporting Training Needs and Progress. Personnel Methods Series No. 3, June 1956. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1957.

23. United States Congress, Public Law 87-415, Manpower Requirements, Developments and Utilization. 87th Congress, S.1991, March 15, 1962.

24. United States Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics in Cooperation with Veterans Administration. Employment Outlook For Sheet Metal Workers, Roofers. Bulletin No. 1255-79. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

25. _____. Manpower Challenge of the 1960s. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

26. _____. Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. A Look at Industrial Training in Mercer Country, New Jersey, September 1959. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1959.

27. _____. Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. Career Patterns of Former Apprentices. Bulletin 1-147, Mar. 1959. Washington: Government Printing Office , 1959.

28. _____. Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. Manpower Development and Training Act. - Allowable Costs on the Job Training Facilities. Circular Letter 63-97.

29. _____. Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. Research on Skill Development in Industry, October 1957. Washington: Government Printing Office.

30. _____. Bureau of Labor Statistics in Cooperation with Veterans Administration. Employment Outlook for Painters, Paperhangers, Glaziers, Asbestos and Insulating Workers. Bulletin No. 1255-54 Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

31. _____. Bureau of Labor Statistics in Cooperation with Veterans Administration. Employment Outlook for Plasterers, Lathers, Cement Finishers. Bulletin No. 1255-63. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

32. _____. Bureau of Labor Statistics in Cooperation with Veterans Administration. Employment Outlook in the Machinists, Tool and Die Makers, Instrument Makers, Other Machining Occupations. Bulletin No. 1255-44. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

## C. PERIODICALS


1. "Apprentice Contest and Instructor Training Course," Heating - Piping, 32: 39-40, October, 1960.

2. "Apprentices Are Hard to Get." Engineering News Record, 166:81, June, 1961.

3. "Apprentices Are Still Short," Business Week, August 15, 1953, p. 46.

4. "Apprentice Training Programs," Air Conditioning and Refrigeration News, 84: 6-7, June 2, 1958.

5. "Apprenticeship Systems Held Vital," Railway Age, 145: 32-3, Aug. 4, 1958

6. "Are You Training Enough Apprentices?", Engineering News-Record, 168: 289, June 21, 1962

7. "Big Fund Helps Apprenticeship," Engineering News-Record, 166:126, March 9, 1961.

8. Bish, John. "A Toolroom Foreman Talks Training," Supervisory Management, 6:51-2, May, 1961.

9. Breslaw, G. "Use Apprentices More, or Lose Them to Other Trades," Domestic Engineering, 197:14, February 1961.

10. "Bricklayers Urge More Training," Engineering News-Record, 162:191, May 14, 1959.

11. "California's Statewide Contest Provides a Yardstick for Apprentice Skills," American Machinist Metalworking Manufacturing, 104:111-14, February 8, 1960.

12. "Carpenters Face Shortage of Journeymen," Engineering News-Record, 169:74, December 13, 1962.

13. Christensen, W. C. "I T U Meets New Technologies Head-On," Graphic Art Monthly, 32:34-6, October 1960.

14. "Contractors Promote Education," Engineering News-Record, 168:81 February 22, 1962.

15. "Council Officers Program to Train More Apprentices," Air Conditioning, Heat and Refrigeration News, 95:1+, Feb. 5, 1962.

16. Csaszar, E. J. "Moldmaking and Tooling; Moldmaker Apprenticeship Training," Plastics Technology, 4:61, January, 1958.

17. Davis, Rennard. "Retraining the Unemployed, III -Skill Improvement Training for Electricians and Plumbers," Monthly Labor Review, October, 1961, pp. 1074-1080.

18. "Deming Picks Key Men From Apprentice Training Graduates," Plant, 19:62-3, May, 1959.

19. Drew, A. S. "Related Science For Apprentices," Industrial Arts and Vocational Education, 42:152-4, May 1953.

20. Engler, B. "We Train our Own," Factory, 119:70-1, Feb. 1961.

21. "E M S A Sponsers Apprenticeship Training Program," Diesel Power, 38:26, October 26, 1960.

22. Favel, W. "He Worked to Learn," Scholastic, 65:32-3, September 15, 1954.

23. Feisthorn, C. H. "Analytical Results of a Carpenter Apprentice Program," Industrial Arts and Vocational Education, 43:192-3, June 1954.

24. Fleming, A. E. "How Detroit Trains Apprentices," Iron Age, 185:62, May 26, 1960.

25. "Five Years Later; 92% of All Graduate California Apprentices Found Still at Same Trade," Air Conditioning and Refrigeration News, 83:1, March 3, 1958.

26. Goshen, Edward E. "Is There a Skilled Labor Shortage," Steele, 151:25-6, Aug. 27, 1962.

27. Groom, Phyllis P. "Retraining the Unemployed, I - European Government Programs," Monthly Labor Review, Aug. 1961. pp.823-828.

28. _____. "Retraining the Unemployed, IV - The Bridgeport Program," Monthly Labor Review, January, 1962, pp. 24-29.

29. _____ "Retraining the Unemployed II - Federal and State Legislation on Retraining," Monthly Labor Review, Sept. 1961,pp.939-943.

30. Hagemeyer, Richard H. "Apprentice Selection Practices," Personnel Journal, 41:135-7, March 1962, pp. 135-137.

31. Hankin, E. K. "Our Critical Craftsman Shortage," Industrial Arts and Vocational Education, 49: 18-19, November 1960.

32. Hyman, I. H. "Toolroom Foreman Talks Training," American Machinist Metalworking Manufacturing, 105:80-2, February 6, 1961.

33. "I. C. I. Billingham Engineering Apprentice School," Chemistry and Industry, January 4, 1958, p. 7.

34. "Industry's Future Tied to Apprenticeship," Engineering News-Record, 159:79, December 26, 1957.

35. "International Apprenticeship Competition," Monthly Labor Review, 78:917, August, 1955.

36. "International Training Fund Has Awarded Grants of More Than $1,820,000 in Three Years," Air Conditioning, Heat and Refrigeration, 91:23, October 24, 1960.

37. "International Union of Operating Engineers Turns to Formal Apprenticeship," Engineering News-Record, 169:77-8, July 26, 1962.

38. "Labor Department Report on Number of Men in Training for Trades," Air Conditioning, Heat and Refrigeration, 86:11, Apr. 20, 1959.

39. McCauley, John S. "Employment Status of Former Apprentices in Early 1954," Monthly Labor Review, 77:751-5.

40. "Mechanic Shortage," Air Conditioning, Heat and Refrigeration News. 96:1, August 27, 1962.

41. Mitchell, James P. "T V A Apprenticeship Program," Power, 104:199-201, November, 1960.

42. Moore, B. V. "Commercial Apprenticeship at Phillips Electric Ltd.," Personnel Management, 43: 110-19, June, 1961.

43. Motley, Arthur W. "Recent Trends in Test Selection of Apprentices," Monthly Labor Review, 76: 1065-70, October, 1963.

44. "M T B A Apprentice Plan Stresses Merit, Not Mere Timeserving," American Machinist Metalworking Manufacturing,106:106-7, December 10, 1962.

45. "National Association of Plumbing Contractors Panel Emphasized Need for Careful Selection of Apprentices," Air Conditioning, Heat and Refrigeration, 90:5, August 8, 1960.

46. "Our Apprentice Setup Is a Scandal," American Machinist, 103:124-6, September 21, 1959.

47. Owen, B. "Training Industrial Electricians," Plant Engineer, 16:113-15, August 1962.

48. Parker, J. A. "Modern Trends in Industrial Arts Vocational Education," Industrial Art and Vocational Education, 43:200, June, 1954.

49. Patterson, W. F. "Importance of Related Instruction to Apprenticeship," Industrial Art and Vocational Education, 43:66A March 1954.

50. _____. "Selecting the Best Qualified for Carpentry Apprenticeship," Industrial Art and Vocational Education, 46:103-3, March 1957.

51. Peterson, J. L. "Training Maintenance Apprentices and Supervisors," Tool Engineering, 44: 331-3, April 1960.

52. "Progress Report of Armour's Tripartite Automotive Committee," Monthly Labor Review, August 1961, pp. 851-857.

53. Ruthenburg, Louis. "The Crisis in Apprentice Training," Personnel 36: 28-33, July 1959.

54. Schuster, J. H. "Career Patterns of Former Apprentices in the Construction Trades," Construction Review, 5:4-7, May 1959.

55. "School, Sponsered Jointly by R A C C A and Union," Air Conditioning, Heat and Refrigeration, 95:7102, February 12, 1962.

56. "Report on Apprenticeship," Supervision, 25:25, March 1963.

57. "Techicians: A New Concern," Engineering News-Record, 162:300, June 18, 1959.

58. "Thirty Become Journeymen in CAlifornia On-the-Job and Classroom Program," Air Conditioning, Heat and Refrigeration, 91:7, October 24, 1960.

59. "To Promote Training," Engineering News Record, 163:81, Aug.27,1959.

60. "Training: A Doomed Crusade?" Engineering News-Record. 162:102, March 26, 1959.

61. "Training For Commerce," Personnel Management, 41:130-2, Sept. 1959.

62. "Trends in the Development of Apprentice-Training Programs," Monthly Labor Review, 78:564, May, 1955.

63. "U. A. Instructors Embark on a Five-Year Plan for Pipefitter Apprentice Instructors," Heating and Piping, 31:91-3, Sept. 1959.

64. Wecksler, A. N. "Worker Training-Industry Does it Better," Mill and Factory, 73:84-7, September 1963.

65. "Weighing Apprenticeship in the Balance," American Machinist Metalworking Manufacturing, June 13, 1960.

66. Weinberg, Edgar. "Retraining Older Workers," Monthly Labor Review, August 1963, pp. 935-939.

67. "West German Apprentice System; Key to Precision Products," Modern Photography, 22:sup W25 + December 1958.

68. Williams, W. T. "Apprentice Plant Engineers Add Experience to Education," Plant Engineering, 17:114-16, September 1963.

# APPENDIX A

## LIST OF ACTIVITIES THAT PARTICIPATED IN THE SURVEY BY GROUP AND SIZE

Activities in Group Nr. 1

| Activity Nor. | Title and Location |
|---|---|
| 1 | U. S. Naval Personnel Center<br>30th Fort Streets, Omaha, Nebraska |
| 2 | U. S. Naval Supply Depot<br>Great Lakes, Illinois |
| 3 | U. S. Naval Ordnance Missile Test Facility<br>White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico |
| 4 | U. S. Naval Training Center<br>Port Washington, New York |
| 5 | U. S. Naval Supply Corps School<br>Athens, Georgia |
| 6 | U. S. Naval Security Group Activity<br>Winter Harbor, Maine |
| 7 | U. S. Naval Communications Station, Norfolk<br>Norfolk, Virginia |
| 8 | U. S. Naval Auxiliary Air Station<br>New Iberia, Louisiana |
| 9 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Los Alamitas, California |
| 10 | U. S. Naval Hospital<br>Beufort, South Carolina |
| 11 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>New Orleans, Louisiana |
| 12 | U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot<br>Hastings, Nebraska |
| 13 | U. S. Naval Supply Center Oakland, Stockton Annex<br>Stockton, California |
| 14 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Willow Grove, Pennsylvania |
| 15 | U. S. Naval Station<br>Boston, Massachusetts |

16 U. S. Naval Air Facility
Litchfield Park, Phoenix, Arizona

17 U. S. Naval Radio Station (T)
Cutler, East Machias, Maine

18 U. S. Naval Turbine Test Station
Trenton, New Jersey

19 U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot
St. Juliens Creek, Portsmouth, Virginia

20 U. S. Naval Underwater Sound Laboratory
Fort Trumbull, New London, Connecticut

21 David Taylor Model Basin
Washington, D. C. 7

22 U. S. Marine Corps Air Facility
New River, Jacksonville, North Carolina

23 U. S. Naval Ordnance Plant
Macon, Georgia

24 U. S. Naval Hospital
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

25 U. S. Naval Communications Station
Navy Nr. (85), FPO San Francisco, Calif.

Activities in Group Nr. 2

| Activity Nr. | Location and Title |
|---|---|
| 26 | U. S. Naval Security Station<br>3801 Nebraska Ave., NW, Washington D.C. |
| 27 | U. S. Marine Corps Air Facility<br>Santa Ana, California |
| 28 | U. S. Naval Auxiliary Air Station<br>Van Voorhis Field, Fallon, Nevada |
| 29 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Glenview, Illinois |
| 30 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Grosse Isle, Michigan |
| 31 | U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot<br>Earle, Red Bank, New Jersey |
| 32 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Cecil Field, Florida |
| 33 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Sanford, Florida |
| 34 | U. S. Naval Hospital<br>Camp Pendleton, California |
| 35 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>New York, Brooklyn, New York |
| 36 | Defense Atomic Support Agency<br>Lake Mead Base, Las Vegas, Nevada |
| 37 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Lakehurst, New Jersey |
| 38 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Seattle, Washington |
| 39 | U. S. Naval Hospital<br>Great Lakes, Illinois |
| 40 | U. S. Naval Ordnance Plant<br>Forest Park, Illinois |

Group Nr. 2 (cont'd)

| | |
|---|---|
| 41 | U. S. Naval Auxiliary Air Station |
| 42 | U. S. Naval Air Development Center<br>Johnsonville, Pennsylvania |
| 43 | U. S. Naval Supply Depot<br>Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania |
| 44 | U. S. Naval Training Center<br>Bainbridge, Maryland |
| 45 | U. S. Naval Hospital<br>Oakland, California |
| 46 | U. S. Marine Corps Air Station<br>Navy Nr. 990, San Francisco, California |
| 47 | U. S. Naval Mine Defense Laboratory<br>Panama City, Florida |
| 48 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Key West, Florida |
| 49 | U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot<br>Charleston, South Carolina |
| 50 | U. S. Naval Shipyard<br>San Francisco, California |

Activities in Group Nr. 3

| Activity Nr. | Title and Location |
|---|---|
| 51 | U. S. Naval Supply Depot<br>Seattle 99, Washington |
| 52 | National Naval Medical Center<br>Bethesda, Maryland |
| 53 | U. S. Naval Supply Center-Navy Base Annex<br>Bayonne, New Jersey |
| 54 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Whidby Island, Oak Harbor, Washington |
| 55 | U. S. Naval Weapons Station<br>Concord, California |
| 56 | U. S. Marine Corps Supply Center<br>Albany, Georgia |
| 57 | U. S. Naval Hospital<br>Portsmouth, Virginia |
| 58 | U. S. Naval Ordnance Plant<br>Iroquois Station, Louisville 14, Kentucky |
| 59 | U. S. Naval Shipyard<br>Charleston, South Carolina |
| 60 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Lemoore, California |
| 61 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Moffett Field, California |
| 62 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Memphis 15, Tennessee |
| 63 | U. S. Naval Shipyard<br>Long Beach 2, California |
| 64 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Brunswick, Maine |
| 65 | U. S. Marine Corps Supply Center<br>Barstow, California |

66 U. S. Naval Air Station
Barbers Point, Hawaii

67 U. S. Marine Corps Supply Center
Barstow, California

68 U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot
Bremerton, Washington

69 U. S. Naval Shipyard
Philadelphia 12, Pennsylvania

70 U. S. Naval Station
Long Beach, California

71 U. S. Naval Marine Engineering Laboratory
Annapolis, Maryland

72 U. S. Naval Air Engineering Center
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

73 U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot
Crane, Indiana

74 U. S. Naval Amphibious Base
Little Creek, Norfolk, Virginia

75 U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot
McAlester, Oklahoma

Activities in Group Nr. 4

| Activity Nr. | Title and Location |
|---|---|
| 76 | U. S. Marine Corps Air Station<br>Cherry Point, North Carolina |
| 77 | U. S. Navy Public Works Center<br>Newport, Rhode Island |
| 78 | U. S. Naval Construction Battalion Center<br>Port Hueneme, California |
| 79 | U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot<br>Hawthorne, Nevada |
| 80 | U. S. Naval Station<br>Treasure Island, California |
| 81 | U. S. Marine Corps Air Station<br>El Toro, Santa Ana, California |
| 82 | U. S. Naval Station<br>Key West, Florida |
| 83 | U. S. Naval Propellant Plant<br>Indian Head, Maryland |
| 84 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Quonset Point, Rhode Island |
| 85 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>North Island, San Diego, California |
| 86 | U. S. Naval Supply Center<br>Oakland, California |
| 87 | U. S. Naval Academy<br>Annapolis, Maryland |
| 88 | U. S. Naval Training Center<br>Great Lakes, Illinois |
| 89 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Jacksonville, Florida |
| 90 | U. S. Naval Station<br>Washington 25, D.C. |

Group Nr. 4 (cont'd)

| | |
|---|---|
| 91 | U. S. Marine Corps Base<br>Camp Pendleton, California |
| 92 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Patuxent River, Maryland |
| 93 | U. S. Naval Shipyard<br>Bremerton, Washington |
| 94 | U. S. Navy Public Works Center<br>Navy Nr. 128, FPO San Francisco, Calif. |
| 95 | U. S. Naval Shipyard<br>Portsmouth, Virginia |
| 96 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Alameda, California |
| 97 | U. S. Naval Shipyard<br>Vallejo, California |
| 98 | U. S. Naval Shipyard<br>Brooklyn, New York |
| 99 | U. S. Naval Ordnance Test Station<br>China Lake, California |
| 100 | U. S. Navy Public Works Center<br>Norfolk, Virginia |

## Activities Whose Public Works Functions Have Been Transferred To Another Activity

| Activity Nr. | Title and Location |
|---|---|
| 101 | U. S. Naval Torpedo Station<br>Keyport, Washington |
| 102 | U. S. Naval Auxiliary Air Station<br>Saufley Field, Pensacola, Florida |
| 103 | U. S. Naval Auxiliary Air Station<br>Imperial Beach 33, California |
| 104 | U. S. Naval Training Center<br>San Diego 33, California |
| 105 | U. S. Naval Supply Center<br>San Diego, California |
| 106 | U. S. Naval Hospital<br>San Diego 34, California |

## Activities With No Civilian Employment

| Activity Nr. | Title and Location |
|---|---|
| 107 | U. S. Naval Facility<br>Nantucket, Massachusetts |
| 108 | U. S. Naval Facility<br>Lewis, Delaware |
| 109 | U. S. Naval Facility<br>Cape Hatteras, Buxton, North Carolina |
| 110 | U. S. Naval Facility<br>Coos Head, Empire, Oregon |
| 111 | U. S. Naval Auxiliary Landing Field<br>Bonham, Navy Nr. 14, FPO San Francisco, Calif. |
| 112 | U. S. Naval Station - Navy Yard Annex<br>Washington, D.C. |

Activities Not Desiring to Participate in the Survey

| Activity Nr. | Title and Location |
|---|---|
| 113 | U. S. Naval Public Works Center<br>San Diego 36, California |
| 114 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>Oceana, Virginia Beach, Virginia |
| 115 | U. S. Marine Corps Recruit Depot<br>Parris Island, South Carolina |
| 116 | U. S. Marine Corps Base<br>Camp LeJeune, North Carolina |
| 117 | U. S. Naval Air Station<br>South Weymouth Massachusetts |

# APPENDIX B

## QUESTIONNAIRE DATA IN TABULATED FORMAT

AGE DISTRIBUTION

GROUP NR. 1

| Age Groups / Activity | Total | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40-44 | 45-49 | 50-54 | 55-59 | 60 + |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 10 | | | | 1 | 3 | 3 | | 3 | |
| 2 | 12 | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | |
| 3 | 16 | | | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | |
| 4 | 16 | | | | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 16 | | | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 6 | 16 | | | | 4 | 2 | 6 | 3 | | 1 |
| 7 | 18 | | | | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| 8 | 22 | | | 3 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 9 | 23 | | | | | 3 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 4 |
| 10 | 24 | | | 6 | 2 | 12 | 3 | 1 | | |
| 11 | 24 | | | | 6 | 6 | 6 | 3 | | 3 |
| 12 | 26 | | | 2 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 3 |
| 13 | 27 | | | | | 1 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 8 |
| 14 | 28 | | | | 1 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 4 |
| 15 | 29 | | | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 8 |
| 16 | 30 | | | | 5 | 2 | 11 | 3 | 6 | 3 |
| 17 | 30 | | | 5 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 18 | 31 | | | | 3 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 4 |
| 19 | 32 | 1 | | 3 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 2 |
| 20 | 34 | | | | 3 | 3 | 11 | 8 | 2 | 7 |
| 21 | 35 | | | 2 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 1 |
| 22 | 36 | | 1 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 2 |
| 23 | 37 | | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 11 | 7 |
| 24 | 37 | | | 1 | 7 | 3 | 11 | 6 | 3 | 6 |
| 25 | 37 | | 2 | 3 | 7 | 15 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| Total | 646 | 1 | 3 | 33 | 76 | 126 | 148 | 97 | 89 | 73 |
| Per cent | 100% | 0.2% | 0.5% | 5.1% | 11.8% | 19.5% | 22.9% | 15.0% | 13.8% | 11.2% |

AGE DISTRIBUTION

GROUP Nr. 2

| Age Groups / Activity | Total | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40-44 | 45-49 | 50-54 | 55-59 | 60 + |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26 | 37 | 1 | | 6 | 7 | 1 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 6 |
| 27 | 39 | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 7 | 6 |
| 28 | 40 | 1 | | 4 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 10 | 3 |
| 29 | 42 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 4 | 8 |
| 30 | 42 | | | 1 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 5 | 6 | 4 |
| 31 | 42 | | | 2 | 8 | 3 | 14 | 5 | 4 | 6 |
| 32 | 43 | | | | 8 | 10 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 5 |
| 33 | 46 | | | 1 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 7 |
| 34 | 49 | | | 4 | 1 | 13 | 11 | 4 | 8 | 8 |
| 35 | 50 | | 4 | 5 | 13 | 10 | 12 | 4 | 2 | |
| 36 | 54 | | | 7 | 3 | 12 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 6 |
| 37 | 55 | | | 5 | 8 | 7 | 13 | 13 | 7 | 2 |
| 38 | 55 | | 1 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 13 | 10 | 11 | 10 |
| 39 | 57 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 4 | |
| 40 | 58 | | 1 | 2 | 8 | 14 | 9 | 8 | 8 | |
| 41 | 60 | | | | 5 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 10 | 6 |
| 42 | 64 | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 9 | 12 | 10 | 16 |
| 43 | 68 | | 1 | 1 | 8 | 16 | 21 | 7 | 8 | 6 |
| 44 | 74 | | | 2 | 18 | 18 | 16 | 8 | 5 | 7 |
| 45 | 76 | | 2 | 1 | 7 | 15 | 20 | 8 | 14 | 9 |
| 46 | 79 | | | 3 | 12 | 23 | 29 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| 47 | 82 | | 2 | 2 | 16 | 33 | 13 | 10 | 4 | 2 |
| 48 | 90 | | 2 | 10 | 10 | 27 | 15 | 10 | 9 | 7 |
| 49 | 92 | | 2 | 12 | 6 | 24 | 23 | 13 | 6 | 6 |
| 50 | 95 | | | 2 | 5 | 16 | 19 | 18 | 18 | 17 |
| Total | 1489 | 5 | 25 | 85 | 182 | 317 | 326 | 206 | 186 | 157 |
| Per cent | 100% | 0.3% | 1.7% | 5.7% | 12.2% | 21.3% | 21.9% | 13.8% | 12.5% | 10.6% |

AGE DISTRIBUTION

GROUP NR. 3

| Age Groups / Activity | Total | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40-44 | 45-49 | 50-54 | 55-59 | 60 + |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 51 | 97 | | 1 | | 3 | 22 | 24 | 19 | 10 | 18 |
| 52 | 99 | | 2 | 3 | 11 | 20 | 27 | 12 | 15 | 9 |
| 53 | 100 | | | 1 | 7 | 22 | 35 | 11 | 11 | 9 |
| 54 | 101 | | | | 8 | 23 | 18 | 14 | 21 | 17 |
| 55 | 104 | | 1 | 3 | 3 | 25 | 15 | 23 | 19 | 15 |
| 56 | 106 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 19 | 24 | 22 | 5 | 13 | 10 |
| 57 | 111 | | | 7 | 14 | 20 | 19 | 23 | 17 | 11 |
| 58 | 112 | | 1 | 1 | 27 | 27 | 24 | 11 | 16 | 5 |
| 59 | 116 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 24 | 29 | 18 | 18 | 9 |
| 60 | 118 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 24 | 24 | 29 | 3 | 18 | 3 |
| 61 | 121 | 2 | | 5 | 24 | 33 | 26 | 18 | 13 | |
| 62 | 121 | | | 3 | 15 | 26 | 23 | 16 | 19 | 19 |
| 63 | 125 | | 1 | 4 | 6 | 15 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 30 |
| 64 | 133 | | | 3 | 14 | 30 | 27 | 19 | 16 | 24 |
| 65 | 134 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 15 | 23 | 22 | 29 | 19 | 11 |
| 66 | 144 | | 1 | 9 | 22 | 30 | 36 | 11 | 22 | 13 |
| 67 | 152 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 11 | 24 | 28 | 19 | 32 | 17 |
| 68 | 154 | | | 14 | 15 | 25 | 35 | 17 | 37 | 11 |
| 69 | 156 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 24 | 30 | 27 | 27 | 34 |
| 70 | 159 | | 1 | 6 | 12 | 28 | 29 | 20 | 23 | 40 |
| 71 | 165 | | 2 | 2 | 13 | 45 | 45 | 19 | 22 | 17 |
| 72 | 166 | | 1 | 11 | 10 | 27 | 18 | 41 | 27 | 31 |
| 73 | 172 | | 1 | 5 | 31 | 42 | 37 | 21 | 24 | 11 |
| 74 | 181 | | | 18 | 34 | 35 | 44 | 10 | 36 | 4 |
| 75 | 189 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 38 | 57 | 35 | 11 | 24 | 12 |
| Total | 3336 | 14 | 38 | 150 | 393 | 695 | 699 | 434 | 533 | 380 |
| Per cent | 100% | 0.4% | 1.1% | 4.4% | 11.5% | 20.8% | 20.9% | 15.9% | 13.1% | 11.9% |

AGE DISTRIBUTION

GROUP NR. 4

| Age Groups / Activity | Total | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40-44 | 45-49 | 50-54 | 55-59 | 60 + |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 76 | 195 | | 1 | 12 | 26 | 32 | 40 | 40 | 27 | 17 |
| 77 | 197 | | 1 | 5 | 5 | 42 | 34 | 47 | 35 | 28 |
| 78 | 198 | | | 6 | 21 | 39 | 43 | 31 | 33 | 25 |
| 79 | 199 | 1 | 6 | 20 | 23 | 35 | 31 | 26 | 27 | 30 |
| 80 | 207 | | 7 | 4 | 15 | 31 | 50 | 34 | 24 | 42 |
| 81 | 209 | | | 2 | 25 | 40 | 39 | 34 | 38 | 31 |
| 82 | 209 | | 4 | 15 | 20 | 42 | 41 | 31 | 26 | 30 |
| 83 | 209 | 1 | 5 | 16 | 41 | 49 | 51 | 27 | 11 | 8 |
| 84 | 212 | | | 7 | 34 | 44 | 47 | 28 | 26 | 26 |
| 85 | 232 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 18 | 40 | 53 | 42 | 33 | 33 |
| 86 | 234 | | 1 | 6 | 5 | 44 | 69 | 39 | 36 | 34 |
| 87 | 250 | | | 9 | 37 | 48 | 48 | 37 | 46 | 25 |
| 88 | 250 | | | 11 | 25 | 43 | 52 | 46 | 32 | 41 |
| 89 | 264 | | 7 | 24 | 32 | 34 | 61 | 47 | 35 | 24 |
| 90 | 278 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 26 | 58 | 44 | 61 | 33 | 37 |
| 91 | 329 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 33 | 68 | 70 | 59 | 43 | 43 |
| 92 | 338 | | | 21 | 33 | 75 | 61 | 71 | 44 | 37 |
| 93 | 365 | | 5 | 30 | 41 | 50 | 61 | 77 | 60 | 50 |
| 94 | 409 | 2 | 8 | 10 | 69 | 124 | 102 | 39 | 13 | 22 |
| 95 | 425 | | 2 | 7 | 40 | 66 | 83 | 103 | 73 | 48 |
| 96 | 443 | 4 | 4 | 12 | 29 | 86 | 108 | 75 | 60 | 70 |
| 97 | 444 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 40 | 71 | 91 | 83 | 86 | 57 |
| 98 | 490 | | | 24 | 29 | 128 | 112 | 120 | 23 | 74 |
| 99 | 513 | 5 | 8 | 18 | 55 | 86 | 93 | 85 | 65 | 92 |
| 100 | 705 | 1 | 7 | 21 | 60 | 153 | 187 | 116 | 91 | 72 |
| Total | 7804 | 19 | 78 | 315 | 782 | 1524 | 1671 | 1398 | 1021 | 996 |
| Percent | 100% | 0.2% | 1.0% | 4.1% | 10.0% | 19.5% | 21.4% | 17.9% | 13.1% | 12.8% |

## ANTICIPATED LOSSES

### GROUP NR. 1

| Activity Nr. | FY 65 | FY 66 | FY 67 | FY 68 | FY 69 | 5 Year Total | Total Journeymn | Losses as % of Journeymn | Variance of % Losses $\sigma^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | 6 | 10 | 60.0 | 635.04 |
| 2 | | | | | 1 | 1 | 12 | 8.3 | 812.25 |
| 3 | | | | | 2 | 2 | 16 | 12.5 | 497.29 |
| 4 | | | 4 | 1 | | 5 | 16 | 31.2 | 12.96 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 37.5 | 7.29 |
| 6 | | 1 | | | | 1 | 16 | 6.2 | 817.96 |
| 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 18 | 33.3 | 2.25 |
| 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 22 | 22.7 | 146.41 |
| 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 23 | 21.8 | 169.00 |
| 10 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 24 | 33.3 | 2.25 |
| 11 | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 24 | 8.0 | 718.24 |
| 12 * | 12 | 13 | 1 | | | 26 | 26 | 100.0 | 4251.04 |
| 13 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 27 | 44.5 | 94.09 |
| 14 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 28 | 32.2 | 6.76 |
| 15 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 29 | 41.4 | 43.56 |
| 16 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 30 | 33.3 | 2.25 |
| 17 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 30 | 20.0 | 219.04 |
| 18 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 16 | 31 | 51.6 | 282.24 |
| 19 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 32 | 31.2 | 12.96 |
| 20 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 34 | 35.3 | .25 |
| 21 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 13 | 35 | 37.2 | 5.76 |
| 22 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 27 | 36 | 75.0 | 1616.04 |
| 23 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 16 | 37 | 43.3 | 72.25 |
| 24 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 37 | 27.0 | 60.84 |
| 25 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 37 | 24.3 | 110.25 |
| Total | 47 | 54 | 44 | 43 | 48 | 236 | 646 | 871.1 | 10598.27 |
| % of Total Employment | 7.3% | 8.4% | 6.8% | 6.7% | 7.3% | 36.5% | $\bar{X}$ = 34.8 | $\sigma^2$=423.93 | $\sigma$ = 20.6 |
| % of Total Employed (corrected within 2$\sigma$) | 5.6% | 6.5% | 6.9% | 6.9% | 7.7% | 33.6% | | | |

* This activity being phased out

ANTICIPATED LOSSES
GROUP NR. 2

| Activity Nr. | FY 65 | FY 66 | FY 67 | FY 68 | FY 69 | 5 Year Total | Total Journeymn | Losses as % of Journeymn | Variance of % Losses $\sigma^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 14 | 37 | 37.9 | 1.44 |
| 27 | 5 | 4 | | 2 | 4 | 15 | 39 | 38.5 | 3.24 |
| 28 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 35 | 40 | 87.5 | 2580.64 |
| 29 | 3 | 1 | | 2 | | 7 | 42 | 16.7 | 400.00 |
| 30 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 42 | 19.1 | 309.76 |
| 31 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 42 | 23.8 | 166.41 |
| 32 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 43 | 18.6 | 327.61 |
| 33 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 26 | 46 | 56.5 | 392.04 |
| 34 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 49 | 40.8 | 16.81 |
| 35 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 20 | 50 | 40.0 | 10.89 |
| 36 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 54 | 27.8 | 79.21 |
| 37 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 33 | 55 | 60.0 | 542.89 |
| 38 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 30 | 55 | 54.5 | 316.84 |
| 39 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 57 | 6.8 | 1218.01 |
| 40 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 30 | 58 | 51.8 | 228.01 |
| 41 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 38 | 60 | 63.4 | 712.89 |
| 42 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 17 | 64 | 26.6 | 102.01 |
| 43 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 68 | 29.4 | 53.29 |
| 44 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 74 | 8.1 | 817.96 |
| 45 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 25 | 76 | 32.1 | 21.16 |
| 46 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 29 | 79 | 36.6 | - |
| 47 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 25 | 82 | 30.5 | 38.44 |
| 48 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 32 | 90 | 35.6 | 1.21 |
| 49 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 19 | 92 | 20.7 | 256.00 |
| 50 | 12 | 18 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 60 | 95 | 63.2 | 702.25 |
| Total | 103 | 109 | 102 | 113 | 116 | 543 | 1489 | 921.6 | 9299.01 |
| % of Total Employed | 6.9% | 7.3% | 6.9% | 7.6% | 7.8% | 36.5% | $\bar{X}$ = 36.7 | $\sigma^2$ =371.96 | $\sigma$ = 19.3 |
| % of Total Employed (corrected) (within 2$\sigma$) | 6.6% | 7.0% | 6.6% | 7.3% | 7.5% | 35.0% | | | |

ANTICIPATED LOSSES

GROUP NR. 3

| Activity Nr. | FY 65 | FY 66 | FY 67 | FY 68 | FY 69 | 5 Year Total | Total Journeymn. | Losses as % of Journeymn | Variance of % Losses $\sigma^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 51 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 10 | 97 | 72.2 | 372.49 |
| 52 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 54 | 99 | 54.6 | 2.89 |
| 53 | 15 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 56 | 100 | 56.0 | 9.61 |
| 54 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 52 | 101 | 51.5 | 1.96 |
| 55 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 42 | 104 | 40.4 | 156.26 |
| 56 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 15 | 43 | 106 | 40.6 | 151.29 |
| 57 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 111 | 9.0 | 1927.21 |
| 58 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 19 | 112 | 17.0 | 1288.81 |
| 59 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 58 | 116 | 50.0 | 8.41 |
| 60 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 110 | 118 | 93.2 | 1624.09 |
| 61 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 100 | 121 | 82.6 | 882.09 |
| 62 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 14 | 60 | 121 | 49.6 | 10.89 |
| 63 | 17 | 18 | 20 | 22 | 23 | 100 | 125 | 80.0 | 734.41 |
| 64 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 30 | 133 | 22.5 | 924.16 |
| 65 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 11 | 35 | 134 | 26.1 | 718.24 |
| 66 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 24 | 144 | 16.7 | 1310.44 |
| 67 | 35 | 35 | 32 | 30 | 30 | 162 | 152 | 100.0 | 2275.29 |
| 68 | 13 | 15 | 10 | 11 | 13 | 62 | 154 | 40.2 | 161.29 |
| 69 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 33 | 156 | 21.1 | 1011.24 |
| 70 | 23 | 24 | 20 | 26 | 21 | 114 | 159 | 71.7 | 353.44 |
| 71 | 20 | 28 | 30 | 30 | 36 | 144 | 165 | 87.3 | 1183.36 |
| 72 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 2k | 95 | 166 | 57.2 | 18.49 |
| 73 | 16 | 16 | 17 | 18 | k9 | 86 | 172 | 50.0 | 8.41 |
| 74 | 49 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 209 | 181 | 115.4 | 3906.25 |
| 75 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 31 | 189 | 16.4 | 1332.25 |
| Total | 337 | 351 | 354 | 367 | 390 | 1799 | 3336 | 1321.9 | 20373.26 |
| % of Total Employed | 10.1% | 10.5% | 10.6% | 11.1 % | 11.6% | 53.9% | $\bar{X}$ =52.9 | $\sigma^2$=814.93 | $\sigma$ = 28.5 |
| % of Total Employed. (corrected within 2 $\sigma$) | 9.1% | 9.9% | 10.0% | 10.4% | 11.1% | 50.5% | | | |

ANTICIPATED LOSSES

GROUP NR. 4

| Activity Nr. | FY 65 | FY 66 | FY 67 | FY 68 | FY 69 | 5 Year Total | Total Journeymn | Losses as % of Journeymn | Variance of % Losses $\sigma^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 76 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 60 | 195 | 30.8 | 712.89 |
| 77 | 20 | 19 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 96 | 197 | 48.7 | 77.44 |
| 78 | 48 | 50 | 53 | 55 | 58 | 264 | 198 | 133.2 | 5730.49 |
| 79 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 125 | 199 | 62.8 | 28.09 |
| 80 | 14 | 16 | 14 | 18 | 20 | 82 | 207 | 39.6 | 320.41 |
| 81 | 28 | 31 | 34 | 37 | 40 | 170 | 209 | 81.3 | 566.44 |
| 82 | 22 | 26 | 31 | 37 | 44 | 160 | 209 | 76.5 | 361.00 |
| 83 | 28 | 25 | 25 | 26 | 28 | 132 | 209 | 62.7 | 27.04 |
| 84 | 26 | 27 | 29 | 26 | 26 | 134 | 212 | 63.2 | 32.49 |
| 85 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 200 | 232 | 86.3 | 829.44 |
| 86 | 67 | 70 | 73 | 75 | 78 | 363 | 234 | 155.0 | 9506.25 |
| 87 | 24 | 24 | 22 | 23 | 22 | 115 | 250 | 46.0 | 132.25 |
| 88 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 85 | 250 | 34.0 | 552.25 |
| 89 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 36 | 264 | 13.6 | 1927.21 |
| 90 | 6 | 16 | 8 | 6 | 11 | 47 | 278 | 16.9 | 1648.36 |
| 91 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 160 | 329 | 48.7 | 77.44 |
| 92 | 36 | 40 | 44 | 48 | 51 | 219 | 338 | 64.8 | 53.29 |
| 93 | 39 | 21 | 10 | 12 | 10 | 92 | 365 | 25.2 | 1043.29 |
| 94 | 13 | 12 | 15 | 10 | 14 | 64 | 409 | 15.6 | 1755.61 |
| 95 | 41 | 49 | 45 | 52 | 54 | 241 | 425 | 56.7 | .64 |
| 96 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 110 | 443 | 24.8 | 1069.29 |
| 97 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 425 | 444 | 95.7 | 1459.24 |
| 98 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 200 | 490 | 40.8 | 278.89 |
| 99 | 75 | 73 | 70 | | | 218 | 513 | 42.5 | 225.00 |
| 100 | 110 | 106 | 95 | 95 | 100 | 506 | 705 | 71.8 | 204.49 |
| Total | 877 | 884 | 864 | 820 | 859 | 4304 | 7804 | 1437.2 | 28629.23 |
| % of Total Employed | 11.2% | 11.3% | 11.1% | 10.5% | 11.1% | 55.2% | $\bar{x}$ =57.5 | $\sigma^2$=1145.2 | $\sigma$ = 33.8 |
| % of Total Employed (corrected within 2$\sigma$) | 10.3% | 10.4% | 10.0% | 9.5% | 9.8% | 50.0% | | | |

METHOD OF RECRUITMENT

Group Nr. 1

| Activity Nr. | In House | | Outside Hire | | Total Journeymen |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Apprentice Program | Helper Program | Certified Journeymen | General Experience | |
| 1 | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 10 |
| 2 | | 4 | 3 | 2 | 12 |
| 3 | | 4 | 3 | 2 | 16 |
| 4 | | 3.5 | 3.5 | | 16 |
| 5 | | 2 | 4 | 3 | 16 |
| 6 | | | 4 | | 16 |
| 7 | | 4 | 2 | 3 | 18 |
| 8 | | 3.5 | | 3.5 | 22 |
| 9 | | 2 | 4 | 3 | 23 |
| 10 | | 2 | 4 | 3 | 24 |
| 11 | | 4 | 3 | 3.5 | 24 |
| 12 | | 3.5 | | 3 | 26 |
| 13 | | 2 | 4 | 3 | 27 |
| 14 | | | 4 | | 28 |
| 15 | | | 4 | 3 | 29 |
| 16 | | 3 | 3 | 3.5 | 30 |
| 17 | | 3.5 | | | 30 |
| 18 | | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3 | 31 |
| 19 | | 3 | 3 | 2 | 32 |
| 20 | | 4 | 3 | 1 | 34 |
| 21 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 35 |
| 22 | | 3 | 4 | 3.5 | 36 |
| 23 | | | 3.5 | 2 | 37 |
| 24 | | 4 | 3 | 3 | 37 |
| 25 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 37 |
| Weight | 70 | 1911.5 | 1962.0 | 1500.5 | 5444 |
| Weighted Percent | 1.3% | 35.1% | 36.0% | 27.6% | 100% |

METHOD OF RECRUITMENT

Group Nr. 2

| Activity Nr. | In House | | Outside Hire | | Total Journeymen |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Apprentice Program | Helper Program | Certified Journeymen | General Experience | |
| 26 | | 2 | 4 | 3 | 37 |
| 27 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 39 |
| 28 | | 3.5 | | 3.5 | 40 |
| 29 | 4 | | 3 | | 42 |
| 30 | | 4 | 3 | 2 | 42 |
| 31 | | 4 | 3 | | 42 |
| 32 | | 4 | 3 | | 43 |
| 33 | | 3 | 4 | 2 | 46 |
| 34 | | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3 | 49 |
| 35 | | 3 | 3 | 4 | 50 |
| 36 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 54 |
| 37 | | 3 | 3 | | 55 |
| 38 | | 3 | 3 | | 55 |
| 39 | | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4 | 57 |
| 40 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 58 |
| 41 | | 4 | 4 | | 60 |
| 42 | | 3 | 3 | | 64 |
| 43 | | 3 | 3 | 3.5 | 68 |
| 44 | | | | | 74 |
| 45 | | 4 | 4 | 4 | 76 |
| 46 | | 3 | 3 | | 79 |
| 47 | | 4 | 4 | 2 | 82 |
| 48 | | 4 | 4 | 4 | 90 |
| 49 | | 3 | 3 | 2 | 92 |
| 50 | | 4 | 4 | 4 | 95 |
| Weight | 169 | 3929 | 4664 | 2800 | 11561 |
| Weighted Percent | 1.5% | 33.9% | 40.3% | 24.3% | 100 % |

METHOD OF RECRUITMENT

Group Nr. 3

| Activity Nr. | In House | | Outside Hire | | Total Journeymen |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Apprentice Program | Helper Program | Certified Journeymen | General Experience | |
| 51 | | 3 | 4 | | 97 |
| 52 | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 99 |
| 53 | | | 3.5 | 3.5 | 100 |
| 54 | | | | 4 | 101 |
| 55 | | | 4 | 3 | 104 |
| 56 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 106 |
| 57 | | 3 | 4 | | 111 |
| 58 | | 2 | 4 | 3 | 112 |
| 59 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | 116 |
| 60 | | 3 | 4 | | 118 |
| 61 | | 4 | 3 | 2 | 121 |
| 62 | | 4 | 2 | 3 | 121 |
| 63 | | 3 | 2 | 4 | 125 |
| 64 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 133 |
| 65 | | 3.5 | 3.5 | | 134 |
| 66 | | 3.5 | | 3.5 | 144 |
| 67 | 2 | | 4 | 3 | 152 |
| 68 | | 4 | 3 | 2 | 154 |
| 69 | | 3 | 4 | 2 | 156 |
| 70 | | 2 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 159 |
| 71 | | | 4 | 3 | 165 |
| 72 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | 166 |
| 73 | | | 3 | 4 | 172 |
| 74 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 181 |
| 75 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 189 |
| Weight | 1574 | 7791 | 10344.5 | 7943.5 | 27653 |
| Weighted Per cent | 5.7% | 28.2% | 37.4% | 28.7% | 100 % |

METHOD OF RECRUITMENT

Group Nr. 4

| Activity Nr. | In House | | Outside Hire | | Total Journeymen |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Apprentice Program | Helper Program | Certified Journeyman | General Experience | |
| 76 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 195 |
| 77 | | 4 | 3 | 2 | 197 |
| 78 | | | 3.5 | 3.5 | 198 |
| 79 | | 3 | 4 | 2 | 199 |
| 80 | | | 4 | | 207 |
| 81 | | 3 | | 4 | 209 |
| 82 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 209 |
| 83 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 209 |
| 84 | | | 3.5 | 3.5 | 212 |
| 85 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 232 |
| 86 | | | 4 | 3 | 234 |
| 87 | | 3 | 2 | 4 | 250 |
| 88 | | 3 | 4 | 2 | 250 |
| 89 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 264 |
| 90 | | 2 | 4 | 3 | 278 |
| 91 | | 4 | 2 | 3 | 329 |
| 92 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 338 |
| 93 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 365 |
| 94 | | 4 | 3 | | 409 |
| 95 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 425 |
| 96 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 443 |
| 97 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | 444 |
| 98 | 2 | 3.5 | 3.5 | | 490 |
| 99 | 3 | 3 | 4 | | 513 |
| 100 | | 2 | 4 | 1 | 705 |
| Weight | 10305.5 | 19962.5 | 24729.5 | 13284.5 | 68282 |
| Weighted Per cent | 15.1% | 29.2% | 36.2% | 19.5% | 100 % |

TRADE CLASSIFICATIONS REPORTED

1. Electrician
2. Equipment Electrician
3. Electrical Mechanic
4. Armature Winder
5. Electrician, Power Plant
6. Power Plant Controlman
7. Power Plant Controlman (H.P.)
8. Power Plant Controlman (L.P.)
9. Diesel Electric Controlman
10. Electrician, Lineman
11. Electrician, Lineman, Telephone
12. MHE Electrical Mechanic
13. Electronics Mechanic
14. Electronics Equipment Repairman
15. Electrician, Communications
16. Radio Mechanic
17. Electrician, Telephone
18. Electrician, Teletype
19. Carpenter
20. Roofer
21. Joiner
22. Wharfbuilder
23. Cabinetmaker
24. Wood and Plaster Worker
25. Linoleum Layer
26. Glazier
27. Saw Filer
28. Upholsterer
29. Sailmaker
30. Mason
31. Plasterer
32. Asphalt and Cement Worker
33. Cement Worker
34. Paver
35. Moulder
36. Painter
37. Letterer and Graniner
38. Sign Painter
39. Painter, Coach
40. Sand Blaster
41. Plumber
42. Water System Controlman
43. Water Plant Operator
44. Sewage System Operator
45. Automotive Mechanic
46. Automotive Mechanic, Accessories
47. Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Mechanic
48. Refrigeration Mechanic

49. Air Conditioning Mechanic
50. Dehumidification Mechanic
51. Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Operator
52. Refrigeration Plant Operator
53. Pipefitter
54. Sprinkler System Mechanic
55. Pipe Coverer and Insulator
56. Heating Plant Operator
57. Heating Plant Operator (H.P.)
58. Gas Heating Equipment Operator
59. Boiler Tender
60. Machinist
61. Toolmaker
62. Model Builder, Metal
63. Machine Parts Assembler
64. Machinist, Automotive
65. Sheetmetal Worker
66. Automotive Mechanic, Body and Fender
67. Boiler Maker
68. Iron Worker
69. Heavy Duty Equipment Operator
70. Engine Equipment Operator and Mechanic
71. Diesel Engine Mechanic
72. Welder, Combination
73. Welder
74. Blacksmith
75. Heat Treater
76. Maintenance Man
77. Millwright
78. Engineman (Hoist and Portable)
79. Rigger
80. Rigger, Antenna
81. Maintenance Mechanic
82. Machinist, Maintenance
83. Galley Equipment Mechanic
84. Pumping Equipment Mechanic
85. Gas Heating Equipment Mechanic
86. Heating Equipment Mechanic
87. Outside Machinist
88. Tool Room Mechanic
89. Elevator Mechanic
90. Office Machine Repairman
91. Central Office Repairman
92. Instrument Mechanic
93. Instrument Mechanic, Electric
94. Electric Clock, Repairman
95. Machine Test Operating Mechanic
96. Locksmith

97. Pest Control Equipment Operator
98. Exterminator
99. Gardner
100. Foreman (various trades)*
101. Chief Quarterman (various trades)*
102. Quarterman (various trades)*
103. Leadingman (various trades)*
104. Head (various trades)*
105. Shop Planner (various trades)*
106. Maintenance Scheduler*
107. Automotive Inspector
108. Inspector (various trades)*
109. Planner Estimator (various trades)*
110. Laborer*
111. Trackman*
112. Driver*
113. Truck Driver*
114. Truck Driver, Heavy*

* Reported on three or less questionnaires through error.

DISTRIBUTION OF JOURNEYMEN BY ACTIVITY - GROUP NR. 1

| Activity Nr. | Carpenter | Painter | Plumber | Electrician | Maintenance Man | Refer. & A/C Mech. | Automotive Mech. | Pipefitter | Machinist | Sheetmetal Worker | Enginemen (H & P) | Welder | Heavy Duty Equip. Mech | Machinist Maintenance | Rigger |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | | 1 | | | |
| 3 | | 1 | | 1 | | | 4 | | | | 3 | | | | |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | 6 | | |
| 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | | | | | | | 2 | | |
| 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | | 2 | 7 | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 4 | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| 10 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | | 6 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | 1 | 3 | | 5 | | 2 | 3 | 7 | | 1 | | | | | |
| 12 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 7 | | | | | 8 | | | 2 | | | 1 |
| 13 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 1 | | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| 14 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 1 | | 5 | | | | | | | |
| 16 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 5 | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 8 | | | | | 2 | | | | 10 | | 2 |
| 18 | 4 | 6 | | 4 | 2 | 2 | | 5 | | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | |
| 19 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | | 4 | | 4 | 3 | | | | | 1 |
| 20 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 1 | | | | | | | 2 | | 3 | 3 |
| 21 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 7 | | 1 | 3 | | | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| 22 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 2 | | 3 | | 2 | | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| 23 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 13 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 12 | | | | | 1 | | | | | 2 |
| | 103 | 75 | 82 | 120 | 32 | 22 | 27 | 19 | 16 | 10 | 5 | 7 | 19 | 5 | 9 |
| % | 15.9 | 11.6 | 12.7 | 18.6 | 5.0 | 3.4 | 4.2 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 2.9 | 0.8 | 1.4 |

DISTRIBUTION OF JOURNEYMEN BY ACTIVITY - GROUP NR. 2

| Activity Nr. | Carpenter | Painter | Plumber | Electrician | Maintenance Man | Refer. & A/C Mech. | Automotive Mech. | Pipefitter | Machinist | Sheetmetal Worker | Engineman (H &P) | Welder | Heavy Duty Equip. Mech. | Machinist Maintenance | Rigger |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26 | | 4 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | |
| 27 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 7 | | 1 | | 1 | 3 | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| 29 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | 2 | | | |
| 30 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 3 | | 6 | | | | | 1 | | | |
| 31 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 7 | | 2 | | | 3 | 1 | | 3 | | | |
| 32 | 4 | 4 | | 4 | | 4 | | | 4 | 4 | | 4 | | | |
| 33 | 9 | 5 | | 4 | | 6 | 12 | 4 | | | | 1 | | | 2 |
| 34 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | | | | 1 | | | |
| 35 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 8 | 3 | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| 36 | 5 | 3 | | 5 | | 4 | | 5 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| 37 | 10 | 7 | 12 | 18 | 8 | | 11 | | | | | | 14 | | 10 |
| 38 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 8 | | | 5 | | | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 |
| 39 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 6 | | 1 | | | 1 | 3 | | 1 | | | |
| 40 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 14 | | 2 | | 6 | 15 | 5 | | 2 | | | |
| 41 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 9 | | 4 | 7 | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 1 | |
| 42 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 17 | | 7 | 5 | 4 | | 1 | | | | | 5 |
| 43 | 12 | 9 | 9 | 12 | | 2 | | | 2 | 3 | | 2 | | 6 | |
| 44 | 17 | 8 | 11 | 13 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| 45 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | | 1 | 3 | 5 | |
| 46 | 16 | 17 | 5 | 18 | 4 | 6 | | | | 3 | | 4 | | | |
| 47 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 17 | 11 | | 2 | | 17 | 4 | 2 | | 7 | 1 | 7 |
| 48 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 5 | | 8 | 9 | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | |
| 49 | 13 | 9 | 8 | 20 | | 12 | 16 | 2 | 7 | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| 50 | 18 | 10 | 15 | 20 | | | 11 | 9 | 11 | 1 | | | | | |
| | 198 | 154 | 142 | 247 | 36 | 66 | 83 | 34 | 75 | 41 | 5 | 29 | 28 | 13 | 25 |
| % | 13.3 | 10.3 | 9.5 | 16.6 | 2.4 | 4.4 | 5.6 | 2.3 | 5.0 | 2.8 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 0.9 | 1.7 |

DISTRIBUTION OF JOURNEYMEN BY ACTIVITY - GROUP NR. 3

| Activity Nr. | Carpenter | Painter | Plumber | Electrician | Maintenance Man | Refer. & A/C Mech. | Automotive Mech. | Pipefitter | Machinist | Sheetmetal Worker | Engineman (H & P) | Welder | Heavy Duty Equip. Mech | Machinist Maintenance | Rigger |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 51 | 7 | 6 | 9 | 12 | | 1 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | 4 | 5 | 1 | |
| 52 | 15 | 15 | 9 | 13 | | 9 | | 5 | 5 | 4 | | 1 | | | |
| 53 | 9 | 12 | | 20 | | | | | 3 | 3 | | 3 | | | |
| 54 | 19 | 26 | 19 | 20 | 4 | | | | 4 | 6 | | 3 | | | |
| 55 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 16 | 1 | 2 | | | 8 | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| 56 | 26 | 17 | 28 | 22 | | | | | 4 | | | 4 | | 5 | |
| 57 | 8 | 8 | 14 | 12 | | 8 | | | | | | | | | |
| 58 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 21 | 22 | 2 | | | | 2 | | 2 | | | 3 |
| 59 | 22 | 22 | 13 | 30 | 3 | 9 | | 8 | | 3 | | | | | 1 |
| 60 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 14 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 3 |
| 61 | 8 | 12 | 9 | 19 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 62 | 20 | 13 | 9 | 17 | | 10 | | 14 | 2 | 3 | | 3 | | | |
| 63 | 15 | 11 | 12 | 27 | 13 | 3 | 9 | 13 | | | | | | 5 | |
| 64 | 14 | 9 | 14 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 15 | | | 1 | | 2 | 5 | | 1 |
| 65 | 14 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 66 | 19 | 17 | 15 | 20 | 13 | 8 | | 12 | 2 | 6 | | 3 | | 6 | |
| 67 | 20 | 11 | 15 | 32 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 14 | | | | 2 | 7 | 11 | 1 |
| 68 | 10 | 8 | | 13 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 14 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 9 | | 10 |
| 69 | 16 | 9 | 27 | 19 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 70 | 13 | 25 | 15 | 24 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 71 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 16 | | 2 | | 8 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 7 | | | 3 |
| 72 | 13 | 10 | 31 | 37 | | 9 | | | 2 | 15 | | 8 | | 24 | |
| 73 | 12 | 11 | 2 | 17 | | 5 | 17 | 15 | 11 | 8 | | 8 | 14 | 18 | 4 |
| 74 | 23 | 18 | 10 | 29 | 3 | 9 | 14 | 24 | 9 | 10 | | 5 | 9 | | 10 |
| 75 | 10 | 10 | 4 | 11 | | 2 | 4 | 10 | 15 | 3 | | 3 | | 8 | 2 |
| | 335 | 294 | 284 | 483 | 84 | 100 | 89 | 143 | 79 | 77 | 10 | 63 | 49 | 78 | 38 |
| % | 10.0 | 8.8 | 8.5 | 14.5 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 4.3 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 1.1 |

DISTRIBUTION OF JOURNEYMEN BY ACTIVITY - GROUP NR. 4

| Activity Nr. | Carpenter | Painter | Plumber | Electrician | Maintenance Man | Refer. & A/C Mech. | Automotive Mech. | Pipefitter | Machinist | Sheetmetal Worker | Engineman (H & P) | Welder | Heavy Duty Equip.Mech. | Machinist Maintenance | Rigger |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 76 | 33 | 43 | 14 | 37 | 1 | 7 | | 9 | 13 | 3 | | 6 | | | 8 |
| 77 | 41 | 26 | 31 | 37 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 78 | 10 | 14 | 9 | 21 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 79 | 15 | 13 | 10 | 16 | | | | 11 | 16 | | | | | | |
| 80 | 19 | 19 | 10 | 24 | | 5 | | 14 | 3 | 4 | 4 | | | 4 | 4 |
| 81 | 24 | 18 | 12 | 35 | 2 | | | | | | | 7 | | | |
| 82 | 21 | 16 | 15 | 12 | | 4 | 16 | | | | 11 | | | 4 | |
| 83 | 37 | 22 | 35 | 41 | | 9 | 22 | | | 17 | | | | | 9 |
| 84 | 27 | 18 | 23 | 52 | 14 | 11 | 36 | 18 | | 12 | | 7 | | 1 | |
| 85 | 17 | 31 | 14 | 36 | | 8 | | 11 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 5 | | 4 | 3 |
| 86 | 15 | 11 | 10 | 27 | 2 | 11 | 27 | 11 | 7 | 4 | 14 | 13 | 16 | | 25 |
| 87 | 1 | 28 | 6 | 27 | | 3 | 7 | 14 | 6 | 10 | 1 | 6 | | 5 | 4 |
| 88 | 30 | 26 | 12 | 24 | | 6 | 11 | 19 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 | | 1 |
| 89 | 14 | 40 | 10 | 27 | | 21 | 18 | 6 | 14 | 9 | | 6 | | | |
| 90 | 24 | 28 | 39 | 61 | 1 | 24 | | | | 10 | | 1 | | | |
| 91 | 35 | 37 | 40 | 43 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 92 | 36 | 36 | 32 | 57 | | 8 | 28 | | 11 | 10 | | | | | 23 |
| 93 | 23 | 10 | 28 | 47 | | 1 | 29 | | 11 | 13 | | 7 | | | |
| 94 | 75 | 62 | 46 | 58 | 13 | 28 | | 26 | 4 | 11 | | | | 11 | |
| 95 | 13 | 28 | 12 | 91 | | 11 | 19 | 15 | 4 | 18 | 77 | 16 | 41 | 21 | |
| 96 | 12 | 27 | 12 | 36 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 97 | 31 | 17 | 27 | 49 | 2 | 5 | 21 | 2 | | 10 | 52 | | 27 | 9 | 3 |
| 98 | 20 | 12 | 16 | 46 | 8 | 21 | 17 | 35 | 2 | 2 | | 5 | | 17 | |
| 99 | 37 | 40 | 35 | 64 | 6 | 23 | 39 | | 31 | 14 | 12 | 12 | | | 16 |
| 100 | 39 | 69 | 17 | 110 | | 52 | 56 | 51 | 42 | 30 | | 20 | 45 | | 16 |
| | 649 | 691 | 515 | 1078 | 62 | 258 | 346 | 242 | 170 | 188 | 174 | 116 | 132 | 76 | 112 |
| % | 8.3 | 8.9 | 6.6 | 13.8 | 0.7 | 3.3 | 4.4 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 1.4 |

# APPENDIX C

## SHOP TRAINING OUTLINE FOR PIPEFITTER APPRENTICES

## SHOP TRAINING OUTLINE FOR PIPEFITTER APPRENTICES

| Areas of Training | Total Hours | Hours Per Year of Apprenticeship 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grand Total | 6400 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 | 1600 |
| 1. Shop Indoctrination and Orientation | | | | | |
| a. Familiarization with shop production and personnel policies, safety and fire prevention regulations | 2 | 2 | - | - | - |
| b. Familiarization with location of shop facilities, equipment, and supplies | 2 | 2 | - | - | - |
| Area Total | 4 | 4 | - | - | - |
| 2. Job Planning | | | | | |
| a. Reading and interpreting blueprints and specifications | 80 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| b. Making templates and sketches | 120 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 60 |
| c. Preparatory job planning | 40 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 20 |
| d. Trade coordination | 40 | - | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Area Total | 280 | 45 | 55 | 60 | 120 |
| 3. Hand, Portable, and Power Tools | | | | | |
| a. Cutting pipe | 100 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| b. Threading pipe | 200 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| c. Bending pipe | 200 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| d. Operation drill press and grinder | 150 | 40 | 30 | 40 | 40 |
| e. Maintaining and repairing tools and equipment | 150 | 25 | 35 | 45 | 45 |
| Area Total | 800 | 190 | 190 | 210 | 210 |
| 4. General Shopwork | | | | | |
| a. Fabricate pipe assemblies | 276 | 78 | 66 | 66 | 66 |
| b. Test valves, gauges, and assemblies | 80 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| c. Repair furnaces | 40 | - | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| d. Repair traps and valves | 40 | - | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| Area Total | 436 | 98 | 116 | 106 | 116 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. | Chemical Systems | | | | | |
| | a. Installing and maintaining acid lines and valves | 200 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| | b. Installing and maintaining pyro lines and valves | 220 | 80 | 60 | 60 | 20 |
| | c. Installing and maintaining ether, alcohol, and ammonia piping, valves, and gauges | 180 | 70 | 40 | 35 | 35 |
| | d. Installing and maintaining soda wash system | 80 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| | Area Total | 680 | 220 | 170 | 165 | 125 |
| 6. | Hydraulic Systems | | | | | |
| | a. Installing and maintaining piping, valves, and gauges of accumulators and presses | 240 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| | b. Installing and maintaining hydraulic testing equipment | 120 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| | Area Total | 360 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| 7. | Sewage Systems | | | | | |
| | a. Installing and maintaining lines from buildings to main sewers | 240 | 40 | 60 | 70 | 70 |
| | b. Repairing valves, piping, and chlorinator in sewage disposal plant | 80 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| | c. Clearing all waste lines | 160 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| | Area Total | 480 | 100 | 120 | 130 | 130 |
| 8. | Fire Protection Systems | | | | | |
| | a. Installing and repairing fire mains, plugs, and valves | 220 | 50 | 55 | 55 | 60 |
| | b. Repairing, testing, and adjusting sprinkler system | 40 | - | - | 10 | 30 |
| | c. Repairing pumps | 60 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| | d. Making wet taps for connections | 40 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| | Area Total | 360 | 75 | 80 | 90 | 115 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. | Fresh Water Systems | | | | | |
| | a. Installing and repairing lines and valves to domestic and industrial buildings | 320 | 44 | 44 | 70 | 70 |
| | b. Repairing pumps | 60 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| | c. Making wet taps for new connections | 24 | - | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| | d. Connecting supply lines to plumbing | 24 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| | e. Connecting supply lines to industrial equipment | 120 | 15 | 30 | 25 | 50 |
| | f. Installing and repairing drinking fountains | 24 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| | Area Total | 480 | 86 | 109 | 130 | 155 |
| 10. | Steam Distribution | | | | | |
| | a. Maintaining valves, piping, and gauges to boilers, generators, and pumps | 380 | 90 | 95 | 95 | 100 |
| | b. Fabricating, installing, and repairing steam lines, valves, gauges, traps, and assemblies | 420 | 140 | 120 | 80 | 80 |
| | Area Total | 800 | 230 | 215 | 175 | 180 |
| 11. | Air Distribution | | | | | |
| | a. Installing and maintaining special pressure and vacuum assemblies | 100 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| | b. Installing and maintaining air reservoirs | 40 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| | c. Making connections to equipment | 60 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| | Area Total | 200 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| 12. | Laboratory Maintenance | | | | | |
| | a. Installing and maintaining special pressure and vacuum assemblies | 160 | 60 | 25 | 20 | 55 |
| | b. Connecting and disconnecting heating, refrigeration, and other testing equipment | 240 | 80 | 25 | 60 | 75 |
| | Area Total | 400 | 140 | 50 | 80 | 130 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13. | Domestic And Industrial Heating And Air Conditioning | | | | | |
| | a. Installing and maintaining steam unit heaters and Radiators | 120 | 30 | 15 | 44 | 31 |
| | b. Installing and maintaining hot water furnaces, radiators, and piping | 140 | 32 | 30 | 50 | 28 |
| | c. Installing and maintaining air conditioners | 140 | 30 | 20 | 50 | 40 |
| | Area Total | 400 | 92 | 65 | 144 | 99 |
| 14. | Suggested Allied Trade Experiences | | | | | |
| | a. Plumbing | 200 | 100 | 50 | 50 | - |
| | b. Welding and brazing | 100 | - | 60 | 40 | - |
| | c. Sheet metal working | 100 | - | 100 | - | - |
| | Area Total | 400 | 100 | 210 | 90 | - |